

Quality Assessment Report for the Academic Year 2022/2023 Program: Graphic Design and Multimedia

1. Introduction

This report presents the evaluations of the program, professors, and courses by the students of the Graphic Design and Multimedia program.

The program evaluation was conducted through the program evaluation questionnaire available in the University Management System (SMU), which contains 21 components. This evaluation is conducted once within an academic year and is completed by all students in this program. The program evaluation questions are primarily formulated as statements, and the assessment was made according to a Likert scale:

- **1** – Strongly disagree
- **2** – Disagree
- **3** – Neutral
- **4** – Agree
- **5** – Strongly agree

The evaluation of courses and professors was also conducted through the questionnaire available in the University Management System (SMU). Unlike the program evaluation, which takes place once per academic year, the course and professor evaluation is conducted at the end of each semester. For this evaluation as well, the questions are structured as statements, and the assessment was made according to the same Likert scale (1 - Strongly disagree; 2 - Disagree; 3 - Neutral; 4 - Agree; and 5 - Strongly agree).

1.1 Report on the Program Evaluation results for the Academic Year 2022/2023

Based on the program evaluation results presented in Table 1, we observe that more than half of the components evaluated in this session were rated 4.00 or higher by the students. Based on these results, special attention should be given to those components rated below 4.00. Overall, student satisfaction with the program for this academic year stands at 80% (or 3.99).

When comparing this result with the previous year, we notice a slight decrease in student satisfaction with the program of approximately 1.5%.

Statement	Previous year	Current year
Materials presented during lectures are provided to us regularly.	4.03	3.90
Suggested literature for courses is made known to us at the beginning of the semester.	4.05	4.04
Course syllabi are provided to students on time.	4.02	4.06
Students are informed of the professors' consultation hours.	4.05	4.02
The scheduled consultation hours with professors are respected.	4.00	3.90
Right from the beginning of the year, students are informed about the assessment methods for the respective course.	4.13	4.04
The teaching methods provide the best way to achieve learning outcomes.	4.03	4.02
Online learning (via Microsoft Teams) does not differ much from in-person classroom learning.	3.83	3.77
The University Management System (SMU) is easy to use and meets students' needs.	3.96	4.05
The classrooms are well-equipped with audio-visual tools to enhance learning.	4.11	3.95
There is a good link between theoretical and practical learning.	4.06	4.01
Students are free to choose their own elective courses.	4.07	4.05
The class schedule is announced on time.	4.06	4.05
The announced class schedule is respected by the professors.	4.05	4.02
The study program is aligned with the needs of the labor market.	4.08	4.00
The study program is comparable to similar programs at other universities.	4.11	4.02
Student workload across courses is balanced (not overloaded).	4.06	3.90
Practical work (internships) outside the institution is well-organized by the University.	3.94	3.89
Employment opportunities after graduation are well known to the students.	4.08	3.89

My overall opinion of this study program is positive.	4.14	4.06
I would recommend this study program to others.	4.12	4.10

Table no. 1 Program evaluation

1.1 Cumulative Report on the Evaluation of Subjects and Instructors for the Graphic Design and Multimedia Program for the Academic Year 2022/2023

The professors of the Graphic Design and Multimedia program were evaluated every semester by the students, and Table 2 presents the cumulative results of this evaluation for each component. Based on the evaluation results of the academic staff, we observe that all components in this session were positively rated by the students - specifically above 4.00 - with the exception of one, which received a score of 3.98. Overall, student satisfaction with their professors for the 2022/2023 academic year stands at 85% (or 4.28).

Statement	Average
The professor organizes and presents the course material well.	4.38
The professor uses sufficient practical examples in class (case studies, practical lab work).	4.24
The professor has dedicated sufficient time to explaining complex concepts.	4.25
The professor gives clear and sufficient instructions to understand the course exercises and assignments.	4.37
The professor's practical knowledge and industry experience have been useful to me.	4.38
During lectures, the professor gave students opportunities to interact with each other.	4.21
The professor encouraged active participation and debate among students.	3.98
The professor has been accessible for clarifications and additional help with the course.	4.34
The professor has provided me with useful and constructive feedback on assignments and other coursework.	4.33
The professor has given useful guidance for my development in the course.	4.29
The professor stimulated my interest in the course and the field in general.	4.28

The professor used technology well during the teaching process (Teams, Forms, software programs, etc.).	4.25
---	-------------

Table no.2 Evaluation of professors

Table 3 displays the results of the course evaluations for the Graphic Design and Multimedia program as rated by the students of this program. All components in this session were rated above 4.00, and student satisfaction with the program's courses for the 2022/2023 academic year stands at 87% (or 4.34).

Statement	Average
The course is appropriate for the study program.	4.42
The purpose and objectives of the course are well explained.	4.32
The literature and additional course materials (books, practical examples, additional reading resources) were up-to-date, accessible, and appropriate.	4.30
The course was delivered effectively (based on the course syllabus).	4.33
I was clear about what was expected of me regarding my commitments in this course.	4.53
The tools and materials used during teaching helped me understand the course better.	4.40
In-class activities helped me understand the course better.	4.38
The course had a good balance of theoretical lectures and practical learning (numerical exercises, case studies, study visits, etc.).	4.24
I had detailed information regarding the assessment methods.	4.41
Group work helped me develop collaboration skills.	4.15
Practical learning (lab work, field work, use of practical examples, etc.) helped me develop professional competencies.	4.25

Table no 3. Course evaluation