



Number: 18/3.281/24
Date: 12 April 2024

Based on Article 61 of the Law on Higher Education ('Official Gazette of the Republic of Srpska', number: 67/20), Article 55 of the Statute of the University of Banja Luka, Article 18 of the Statute of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka, the Scientific-Teaching Council of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka, at their 8th session, held on 12 April 2024, a d o p t e d t h e:

DECISION

on the adoption of the Analysis of the Report on the conducted student survey regarding the quality of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year.

I

The Analysis of the Report on the conducted student survey regarding the quality of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka, is hereby adopted.

II

An integral part of this Decision is the Analysis of the Report on the conducted student survey regarding the quality of the teaching process and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka.

III

The decision takes effect on the day of its adoption.

Explanation:

The Scientific-Teaching Council of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka, at its 8th regular session held on April 12, 2024, reviewed the Analysis of the Report on the conducted student survey regarding the quality of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year, submitted by the Committee for Quality Assurance and Improvement of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka.

Since there were no objections, the Scientific-Teaching Council of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Banja Luka, decided as stated in the operative part.

Delivered to:

1. Scientific-Teaching Council,
2. Materials of the Scientific-Teaching Council
3. a/a.

The president of
the Scientific-Teaching Council
Prof. Ranko Škrbić, PhD

**Committee for Quality Assurance and Improvement
Faculty of Medicine
University of Banja Luka**

Analysis of the Report on the conducted student survey regarding the quality of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year

The analysis we are providing is a requirement set forth by the Regulation on the Organization and Work of the Committee for Quality Assurance and Improvement (Article 6, paragraph 7, which prepares the Annual Report on Quality Indicators for the previous calendar year, proposing measures for improvement). It relates to the Reports on the conducted student survey regarding *the quality of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year and the Survey for evaluating the work of the management and administrative services for the 2022/2023 academic year*. The Committee for Quality Assurance and Improvement of the Faculty of Medicine, which proposes this analysis, was established at the meeting of the Scientific-Teaching Council in March 2024.

The student survey at the Faculty of Medicine was conducted on two occasions (from the 13th to the 15th week of the semester), as prescribed by the Regulation on the Student Survey on the Quality of the Teaching Process.

The student survey covered:

1. Evaluation of the work of teachers and associates in the teaching process for each individual subject, and
2. Evaluation of the work of the management (dean and vice-deans) and administrative services of the faculty/Academy of Arts (secretaries and staff in the student service and library).

The preparation for the survey was carried out according to the guidelines provided by the Quality Assurance Office of the University of Banja Luka. The vice-dean for teaching, together with the quality coordinator, informed the teachers and associates via official email addresses about the possibility of correcting/updating the survey lists, with the attached instructions. Students were also informed about the student survey (via the faculty notice board and website), along with Attachment 3: Notice for Students. The survey was conducted electronically through the "e-student" application, and all principles and guidelines were adhered to (voluntariness, anonymity, neutrality, and protection of the dignity of individuals whose work was being evaluated).

The summary reports on the survey results were delivered to the management of the Faculty of Medicine, while individual reports were also made available to all teachers and associates through the "e-employee" application. Based on the submitted reports, both the faculty management and each teacher or associate individually had insight into the results achieved during the survey. This is considered one of the key indicators of the quality of the teaching process, as well as evidence of teaching abilities. The survey, as such, also serves as proof of teaching capabilities and is taken into account during the selection or promotion in academic titles.

Analysis of the evaluation of the teaching process during the 2022/2023 academic year

From the summary report for the Faculty of Medicine, we can see the scope of the survey implementation, specifically the number of planned and realized surveys by subject and the number of students who participated.

1. Total number of survey questionnaires (by subject):
The survey was planned to cover 287 subjects (LECTURES), and 220 were realized, resulting in a realization rate of **76.66%**.
Similarly, 278 subjects (PRACTICAL CLASSES) were planned, and 107 were realized, which represents **37.28%**.
2. Total number of survey questionnaires (by number of students):
The participation of 6,928 students was planned to evaluate theoretical teaching (LECTURES), but 1,110 students participated, which represents **16.02%**.
The participation of 6,765 students was planned to evaluate practical teaching (PRACTICAL CLASSES), but 656 students participated, which represents **9.70%**.
The percentage of completed surveys for practical teaching (PRACTICALS) is significantly lower compared to theoretical teaching (LECTURES).

Analysis of the summary report for the faculty

Analyzing the data on the percentage of completed surveys compared to the planned ones, we can see that the percentages of 16.02% for lectures and 9.70% for practicals are exceptionally low. From this, it can be concluded that either the plans were unrealistic or that students, for various reasons, missed the survey. In discussions with student representatives about the reasons for such low completion rates, we received responses such as: "don't have time," "not interested," "don't have access to a computer," "who will fill out surveys for so many subjects?" "If it's not mandatory, we don't care." This clearly shows that the principle of voluntariness is in conflict with the planned scope. In our opinion, consideration should be given to amending the regulation so that completing the survey becomes an obligation rather than a student's right. In this way, students would participate at a level that ensures the relevance of the survey, and the faculty management would receive valuable guidelines on how to improve the quality of the teaching process.

If we consider the criterion that an average rating of at least 2.50, achieved after the student survey, is considered satisfactory, we can conclude from the summary report that students have rated the quality of the teaching process at the Faculty of Medicine extremely highly. Almost all questions regarding the quality of teaching were rated *above* 4.5, within the numerical range of one (1) to five (5). The exception is the question "The teacher conducted lectures according to the plan and schedule and kept records of student attendance," which was rated 3.77 for *lectures* and 3.86 for *practicals*. Both ratings are satisfactory but leave room for improvement.

A report with such findings will be presented to the Teaching-Scientific Council of the Faculty of Medicine and submitted to all department heads, with a note for enhanced monitoring of the work of teachers and associates and emphasis on their responsibilities during the teaching process.

Analysis of the summary report by study programs

Reports for individual *study programs* show identical trends regarding the percentage of completed surveys relative to the number of students. Most aggregate ratings fall within the range of 4.5 to 5, except for the responses to the questions: "The teacher conducted lectures according to the plan and schedule and kept records of student attendance," and "Changes in the lecture schedule were announced in a timely manner" for lectures, as well as "Mastering the material of the course" which were rated between 3.8 and 4. The participation rates range from 5% to 8% for the study programs in Medicine, Dentistry, and Medical Laboratory Diagnostics, up to 10-20% for other Health Sciences programs, with the highest student response rate (over 50%) observed in the Pharmacy program.

Analysis of individual reports for each course

According to the Regulation on the Student Survey, the established criteria for processing survey results and survey reports stipulate that the results of surveys on the work of teachers/associates for study programs with *fewer than five (5) students are not subject* to processing. Additionally, the results of surveys on the work of teachers and associates for each individual subject are considered relevant if, out of the total number of students included in the survey, the questionnaires were completed by: 1) 80% of students, for groups of 5–10 students; 2) 70% of students, for groups of 11–20 students; 3) 65% of students, for groups of 21–30 students; 4) 60% of students, for groups of 31–50 students; 5) 50% of students, for groups of 51–100 students; and 6) at least 40% of students, for groups larger than 100 students.

If the analysis is viewed through these two criteria, we can conclude that, in most individual cases, the surveys are not relevant. The majority of teachers and associates received satisfactory ratings. Only a small number were rated below 2.5, but these surveys are considered irrelevant due to the small number of students (fewer than 5), making it impossible to draw similar conclusions.

Analysis of survey results for management and administrative services

Analyzing the survey results for management and administrative services, we note the following: According to the criteria, the survey results on the work of the Faculty's management and administrative services are considered relevant if at least 30% of the total number of students included in the survey completed the questionnaires. The number of completed surveys was 186, which, compared to the total number of over 2,000 students, renders the survey irrelevant. However, even with this sample, the Faculty of Medicine achieved good results. The majority of responses were in the range of "agree" or "strongly agree."

A few individual opinions were highlighted, mostly concerning the availability of soap and toilet paper in publicly accessible restrooms. It should be noted that the building used by the Faculty of Medicine is shared with the Employment Bureau, meaning a significant number of individuals (students and service users of the Bureau) circulate through the building daily, with only two publicly accessible restrooms available. Cleaning staff have been instructed to check the restrooms multiple times a day to ensure the availability of hygiene supplies.

Action Plan

At the Scientific-Teaching Council of the Faculty of Medicine, potential corrective measures provided for in the regulations will be presented. These measures, which the Faculty Council may implement to improve the quality of work of teachers/associates, include:

1. Recommending teachers/associates to undergo professional development to enhance the quality of their teaching.
2. Appointing a competent teacher/associate to monitor the work of the teacher/associate during the next academic year.
3. Designating a responsible teacher/associate from the List of Responsible Teachers/Associates who holds the same specialization within the narrower scientific field.
4. Assigning another teacher/associate from the List of Responsible Teachers/Associates.

It was agreed with the members of the committee that each program director of the Faculty of Medicine, together with the department head, will conduct a discussion with any teacher who received a rating below 2.5 on the survey for any reason. Following this, possibilities for improvement will be reviewed before the beginning of the next academic year.

Additionally, members of the quality committee committed to more actively engaging with student representatives in group discussions to address general issues in teaching, as well as individually to hear opinions from students who believe the teaching process can be improved or who have personal concerns related to the teaching process.

The general conclusion is that the survey at the Faculty of Medicine for the 2022/2023 academic year was conducted in full compliance with the recommendations outlined in the regulations. However, the low participation of students raises questions about the survey's relevance based on the set criteria. Despite this, the Faculty of Medicine received generally high ratings. Corrective measures for teachers and associates who did not meet the criteria will be discussed with department heads, while the reasons for the low response rate will be analyzed with students. Efforts will also be made to understand specific issues in teaching and encourage students to engage more actively in future surveys.