

Student quality assessment report for the academic year 2021/2022 Program: Hospitality and Tourism Management

1. Introduction

This report presents the evaluations of the program and academic staff by students.

Hospitality and Tourism Management program.

The program evaluation was carried out through the established program evaluation questionnaire.

in the University Management System (UMS), which contains 21 components. This assessment

It is carried out once within an academic year and the evaluation is done by the students of this program.

The program evaluation questions are mainly structured in the form of statements and evaluations.

Their answer was based on a Likert scale (1 - I don't know; 2 - I strongly disagree; 3 - I agree).

partially; 4-Agree; and 5- Completely agree).

The evaluation of the academic staff was also carried out through the questionnaire placed on

University Management System (UMS). Unlike program evaluation, which

are carried out once within an academic year, the evaluation of academic staff is carried out in each

semester. The questions, also in this assessment, are constructed in the form of statements and the assessment of

Their responses were made on a Likert scale (1 - I don't know; 2 - I strongly disagree; 3 - I agree).

partially; 4 - Agree; and 5 - Completely Agree).

1.1 Students' program evaluation report for the academic year 2021/2022

Based on the results of the program evaluation presented in Table 1, we note that the majority of the components of this session were positively evaluated by the students. It is worth noting that

Based on the results of this assessment, all components are rated above 3.5, for

difference from last year when only 47% of the components were above 3.5. Referring to

results, the management of this Faculty must pay attention to all components,

which were rated below 4. Considering overall student satisfaction with the program, this academic year is 78% or 3.9. If we make a comparison with the previous year we have a increase in student satisfaction with the program by about 9%.

Table no.1 Program evaluation

QUESTION	Average
Materials presented during lectures are provided to students regularly.	3.95
Suggested literature for the courses is announced at the beginning of the semester.	4.01
Course syllabi are provided to students in a timely manner.	3.94
Students are informed of the teacher consultation schedule.	3.84
Consultation hours with teachers are respected.	3.88
From the beginning of the year, students are informed about the assessment method for the respective subject.	3.88
Teaching methods provide the best way to achieve learning outcomes	3.96
Online learning (via Microsoft Teams) is not much different from in-class learning.	3.65
The University Management System (UMS) is easy to use and meets the needs of students	3.98
Classrooms are well equipped with audio-visual aids for quality learning.	3.84
There is a good connection between theoretical and practical learning.	3.86
The student is free to determine his/her own elective courses.	3.98
The class schedule is announced in time.	3.94
The announced teaching schedule is respected by teachers.	3.88
The study program is in line with the needs of the labor market	3.84
The study program is comparable to similar programs in Other universities	3.76
Student engagement in the course is balanced (not overloaded)	3.92
Practical work outside the institution is well organized by the University	3.75
Employment opportunities after graduation are well known to students.	3.86
My overall opinion of this study program is positive.	3.90
I would recommend this study program to others.	3.89

1.1 Cumulative evaluation report of academic staff for

BSc. Hospitality and Tourism Management program for the academic year 2021/2022

The academic staff of the Hospitality and Tourism Management program has been evaluated in every semester by students and the cumulative assessment results for each are presented.

component in table no. 2. Based on the results of the evaluation of academic staff, we note that all components of this session were positively evaluated by the students, or more precisely over 4. Also, the management of this Faculty must remain committed to improving further increase student satisfaction with academic staff. Overall, Student satisfaction with academic staff for the 2021/2022 academic year is 82% or 4.1. If we make a comparison with the previous year, we notice that we have a 2% decrease in customer satisfaction. students with academic staff.

Table no.2 Evaluation of academic staff

question	Average
The course syllabus, which includes the content and method of assessment, was presented to me in detail at the beginning of the TERM	4.11
The teacher's attendance during the semester has been regular and in AGE	4.11
The teacher has always come prepared to the lesson.	4.13
Activities during the semester have created opportunities for students to engage in discussions, creative activities, and it is encourage student interaction (group work, pairs, etc.)	4.04
The teacher was available to the students for consultations, at the University or online	4.07
The teacher encourages diverse student opinions. and respects them	4.13
The materials provided for study during the semester were suitable for acquiring knowledge and skills provisions for this subject	4.08
The materials provided by the teacher have been published on time. in SMU, Teams, or in Moodle	4.04

Students were informed in advance about the criteria evaluation of the exam/papers, or of their work, in GENERAL	4.09
The evaluation of students' work on the course during the semester is done according to the course syllabus	4.10
If the lesson was held in the classroom, the means of concretization (markers, projector, board, etc.) and the learning space have been available and were well used by the teacher	4.09
The teacher used the virtual learning platform Microsoft Teams and its easy possibilities	4.04
The course was useful for students.	4.11