	RULES OF PROCEDURE
	STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS
Responsibility for implementation	 Evaluation of teaching quality of course teachers and associates with the aim of improving it based on students' assessments, suggestions and proposals. Issuance of the Certificate of Conducted Institutional Teaching Quality Evaluation with positive evaluation results for the purpose of election/re-election into a higher rank. Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee Department head Course coordinator Teacher/associate Expert Advisor for Quality Assurance and Improvement
Implementation and data processing methodology	The teaching quality of teachers and associates in undergraduate, graduate and integrated studies is evaluated in the last week of classes in accordance with the course syllabus. The evaluation is conducted on MS Teams using an MS Forms questionnaire approved by the University Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee. At the beginning of each academic year, the expert advisor informs the department heads and teachers/associates undergoing the election/re-election procedure in the upcoming calendar year about the obligatory student evaluation of the teacher. Implementation process: - course coordinator/department head/teacher/associate submits on the
	SharePoint Portal (SPP) the Request for the Implementation of Student Evaluation of Teachers no later than fourteen (14) days before the date scheduled for conducting the student evaluation for a particular course, i.e. no later than fourteen (14) days before the end of course classes (according to the syllabus) - the expert advisor uploads the questionnaire on MS Teams based on the submitted request - if the course is not conducted via MS Teams, the expert advisor will send a link to the MS Forms questionnaire to the department secretary, who will upload the link on the Merlin e-learning platform; if the course coordinator does not use the Merlin platform either, the expert advisor will send the link to the MS Forms questionnaire to the department secretary, who will forward the link to the student representative of the year of study and the group email address of that year of study - the teacher is obligated to invite students to complete the questionnaire
Publication of results	The expert advisor sends the evaluation results to the evaluated teacher, course coordinator and department head after the second exam period of the course undergoing student evaluation, i.e. no later than July 15 in the academic year in which the evaluation is conducted. The following persons have the right to access the evaluation results: - evaluated teacher - course coordinator

Implementation	- department head - chair of the Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee - vice dean for teaching - vice dean for quality assurance - dean The evaluation is conducted based on the submitted requests.
dynamics	The evaluation can be used for the purpose of issuing the Certificate of Conducted Institutional Teaching Quality Evaluation.
Procedure in case of unsatisfactory evaluation results	The evaluation results are unsatisfactory if the average evaluation score of all parts of the questionnaire in the section <i>Evaluation of the course teacher</i> is less than three (< 3.00). In this case, the teacher/associate cannot get the Certificate of Conducted Institutional Teaching Quality Evaluation and is obligated to undergo self-evaluation using the form stipulated at the University level. The implementation of self-evaluation is initiated and monitored by the Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee. They inform the dean, the vice dean for teaching and the vice dean for quality assurance about the self-evaluation results. In the case of unsatisfactory evaluation results for a particular teacher/associate, the evaluation must be repeated in the following academic year.
Issuance of the Certificate of Conducted Institutional	The Certificate of Conducted Institutional Teaching Quality Evaluation with positive evaluation results for the purpose of election/re-election into a higher rank is issued to teachers or associates whose average evaluation score in the section <i>Evaluation of the course teacher</i> of the questionnaire is equal to or
Teaching Quality Evaluation	greater than three (\geq 3.00). At the teacher's request, the certificate is issued by the expert advisor and signed by the chair of the Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Dear colleagues,

by filling out this questionnaire, you can influence the improvement of teaching and let us know if there are any shortcomings in the teaching process. Your opinion is important to us, so we kindly ask you to answer the questions honestly and benevolently by expressing your opinion.

Your responses are completely anonymous. The questions are divided into several units: questions about the course, the teacher and the course overview.

The language used in this questionnaire is gender-neutral and is equally applicable to both genders.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE COURSE

What was your interest in the content of the course at the beginning of the course?	a) none	b) low	c) medium	d) high
How much did you prepare for this course per week?		our b) 1–3 h	ours c) 3–5 h	ours d) more than 5
ECTS credits appointed to the course are harmonized with the workload (1 ECTS = 25 to 30 working hours during the semester for class and independent work)	•	•	b) it is harm d) I have a l	ionized ot more obligations
Did the teacher hold classes regularly?	a) yes	b) no	c) cannot est	imate
What grade do you expect from this course?	a) 2	b) 3	c) 4	d) 5

B. EVALUATION OF THE COURSE TEACHER

On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 - Strongly disagree; 5 - Strongly agree; 0 - Cannot evaluate), indicate **your level** of agreement with the following statements.

	1	2	3	4	5	0
The teacher clearly and in detail familiarized the students with the course outcomes (learning objectives, work assignments).						
The teacher clearly and in detail explained the assessment and evaluation criteria.						
During the semester, the teacher evaluated student work in accordance with the course syllabus (midterm exams/projects/practicals/seminars/practical work) and regularly provided feedback.						

1	2	3	4	5	0		
D. SATISFACTION WITH THE TEACHER AND THE COURSE AND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 – Strongly disagree; 5 – Strongly agree; 0 – Cannot evaluate), indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.							
	I				-		
1	2	3	4	5	0		
1	2		4	5	-		
		3	-		-		
		3	-		-		
		3	-		-		
				### Company of the Co	### Company of the control of the co		

Elaborate on your evaluation.
Additional comments and suggestions for improvement