



EUA

EUROPEAN
UNIVERSITY
OF ARMENIA

ԵՐԱՅԱՆ
ԵՎՐՈՊԱԿԱՆ
ՅԱՄԱԼՍԱՐԱՆ



**ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF A STUDENT SURVEY ON
EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE EUA
ACADEMIC STAFF AND THE QUALITY OF THE COURSES IN
THE FULL-TIME BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S DEGREE
STUDENTS OF THE 1ST SEMESTER OF THE 2023-2024 ACADEMIC
YEAR**

YEREVAN 2023

INTRODUCTION

The European University of Armenia (hereinafter referred to as the EUA), pursuing the implementation of its statutory and strategic goals, considers it a priority to train specialists in accordance with the needs and requirements of the labor market. To this end, in the process of reforms carried out at the EUA, special importance is attached to the feedbacks and recommendations of stakeholders, in particular students, to identify, recruit, study and analyze their needs and expectations. Taking into account the above mentioned, the EUA Quality Assurance and Educational Reforms regularly assesses the quality of courses and the activities of the academic staff by conducting surveys among students that identify positive aspects of the educational process and areas that need to be improved. The data obtained from the survey will be considered in the processes of reviewing educational programs and ensuring quality.

The survey was conducted on November 16-23, 2023. Students, in the Bachelor's part-time education system of the 1st semester of the 2023-2024 academic year, were chosen for the survey. About 56.5% of students participated in the survey (see Table 1). Taking parallels with the indicators of the previous academic year, the number of students participating in the survey decreased by 8.8% (from 65.3% to 56.5%), which is probably due to the fact that the surveys are conducted in electronic (less resource-intensive) form starting from this academic year. Another reason is related to students' unwillingness to participate in surveys.

Table 1. The number of survey participants, by specialty

N	Specialty	Total number of students/ 1088 (100%)	The number of survey participants/615(56,5%)
1.	Management: Bachelor's degree/BA/	1st: 36 2nd: 23 3rd: 41 4th: 21 Total: 121	1st: 10 (27.7%) 2nd: 14 (60.8%) 3rd: 29 (70.7%) 4th: 10 (47.6%) Total: 63 (52%)
	Group taught in English	1st: 10 2nd: 13 3rd: 8 4th: 15 Total: 46	1st: 4 (40%) 2nd: 6 (46%) 3rd: 5 (62.5%) 4th: 7 (46.6%) Total: 22 (47.8%)
	Management: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 7 2nd: 7 Total: 14	1st: 6 (85.7%) 2nd: 3 (42.8%) Total: 9 (64.2%)
	Group taught in English	1st: 1 Total: 1	1st: 1 (100%) Total: 1(100%)

2.	Finance	1st: 15 2nd: 12 3rd: 15 4th: 7 Total: 49	1st: 7 (46.6%) 2nd: 5 (41.6%) 3rd: 12 (80%) 4th: 4 (57%) Total: 28 (57%)
3.	Marketing	1st: 19 Total: 19	1st: 13 (68.4%) Total: 13 (68.4%)
4.	International relations: Bachelor's degree/BA/	1st: 14 2nd: 17 3rd: 30 4th: 11 Total: 72	1st: 4 (28.5%) 2nd: 12 (70.5%) 3rd: 10 (33.3%) 4th: 5 (45.4%) Total: 31 (43%)
	International relations: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 6 2nd: 6 Total: 12	1st: 6 (100%) 2nd: 0 (0%) Total: 6 (50%)
5.	Law: Bachelor's degree/BA/	1st: 57 2nd: 68 3rd: 30 4th: 20 Total: 175	1st: 31 (54.3%) 2nd: 19 (27.9%) 3rd: 16 (53.3%) 4th: 10 (50%) Total: 76 (43.4%)
	Law: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 10 2nd: 9 Total: 19	1st: 2 (20%) 2nd: 3 (33.3%) Total: 5 (26.3%)
6.	Information Technology: Bachelor's degree/BA/	1st: 43 2nd: 50 3rd: 19 4th: 20 Total: 132	1st: 32 (74.4%) 2nd: 23 (46%) 3rd: 11 (57.8%) 4th: 10 (50%) Total: 76 (57.5%)
	Group taught in English	1st: 23 2nd: 16 3rd: 13 4th: 10 Total: 62	1st: 20 (86.9%) 2nd: 14 (87.5%) 3rd: 5 (38.4%) 4th: 5 (50%) Total: 44 (70.9%)
	Information Technology: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 8 2nd: 2 Total: 10	1st: 0 (0%) 2nd: 2 (100%) Total: 2 (20%)
	Group taught in English	1st: 1 2nd: 3 Total: 4	1st: 1 (100%) 2nd: (0%) Total: 1 (25%)
7.	Synopsis: Bachelor's degree/BA/	3rd: 9 4th: 8 Total: 17	3rd: 9 (100%) 4th: 8 (100%) Total: 17 (100%)
	Synopsis: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 18 2nd: 21 Total: 39	1st: 18 (100%) 2nd: 21 (100%) Total: 39 (100%)
8.	Service	1st: 10 2nd: 21 3rd: 8	1st: 9 (90%) 2nd: 17 (80.9%) 3rd: 4 (50%)

		4th: 20 Total: 59	4th: 8 (40%) Total: 38 (64.4%)
8.	Psychology: Bachelor's degree/BA/	1st: 16 2nd: 17 3rd: 2 4th: 9 Total: 56	1st: 10 (62.5%) 2nd: 13 (76.4%) 3rd: 9 (64.2%) 4th: 5 (55.5%) Total: 37 (66%)
	Group taught in English	1st: 11 2nd: 3 3rd: 5 4th: 3 Total: 22	1st: 2 (18%) 2nd: 0 (0%) 3rd: 1 (20%) 4th: 0 (0%) Total: 3 (13.6%)
	Psychology: Master's degree/MA/	1st: 4 2nd: 2 Total: 6	1st: 2 (50%) 2nd: 1 (50%) Total: 3 (50%)
9.	Graphic design	1st: 23 2nd: 10 3rd: 18 4th: 13 Total: 64	1st: 19 (82.6%) 2nd: 8 (80%) 3rd: 11 (61.1%) 4th: 9 (69.2%) Total: 47 (73.4%)
10.	Architecture	4th: 3 Total: 3	4th: 2 (66.6%) Total: 2 (66.6%)
11.	Linguistics	1st: 20 2nd: 29 3rd: 2 4th: 21 Total: 84	1st: 13 (65%) 2nd: 18 (62%) 3rd: 11 (78.5%) 4th: 8 (38%) Total: 50 (59.5%)
12.	Academic pedagogy: Master's degree/MA/	2nd: 2 Total: 2	2nd: 2(100%) Total: 2 (100%)

The survey was conducted electronically through the program Google Forms. The questions were developed and compiled by the EUA Quality Assurance and Educational Reforms Department. The questionnaire consists of closed and open questions. In order to assess the quality of the courses of the EUA educational programs and the activities of the academic staff, the students were asked the following questions to find out:

1. How interesting are the courses?
2. How accessible and easily explained are the courses?
3. How good are the academic staff-student relationships?
4. Are professors consistent in checking students' work?
5. Do the representatives of the academic staff treat students with respect?
6. Do the representatives of the academic staff create a positive and pleasant atmosphere for asking additional questions about the material that is not understood?

7. Do the representatives of the academic staff inform about the assessment methodology/approaches and assess objectively?
8. Do the representatives of the academic staff encourage comments and questions?
9. Do students want to meet the representatives of the academic staff for other courses?
10. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the courses?
11. What are the recommendations for eliminating the incompleteness?

Before conducting surveys, the goals of the surveys, the importance of the outcomes, and the requirements presented in the questionnaire were presented to the students. The surveys were carried out on the principle of anonymity, which ensured the objectivity of the assessment.

CONCLUSION

By summarizing the outcomes of the survey, we can come to the following conclusions:

1. Most of the representatives of the EUA academic staff are professional specialists, have a high level of educational and methodological preparedness,
2. The practical component is used in most of the EUA courses,
3. The academic staff-student relationship at the EUA is mainly on a partnership level,
4. Most of the lecture materials are accessible and easy to understand,
5. The courses are mostly held in an interesting and positive atmosphere,
6. The majority of students are mainly integrated in the teaching-learning process,
7. Most of the representatives of the academic staff are consistent and willing to provide necessary guidance and counseling to students,
8. The majority of the representatives of the academic staff are generally consistent in checking assignments,
9. The representatives of the academic staff generally encourage students' comments and questions,
10. The representatives of the academic staff generally give full answers to students' questions,
11. The representatives of the academic staff are respectful to students,
12. Students generally want to meet most of the representatives of the academic staff for other courses,
13. A student-centered approach is emphasized at the EUA.

At the same time, through the survey, a number of issues related to the courses and the academic staff¹ became evident. The measures aimed at solving them will contribute to the improvement of the

¹ Armenian history - A. Maloyan,
Biosecurity - A. Dallaqyan,
Sustainable development and ecology - T. Mkrtychyan, T. Safaryan
Business statistics and data analysis - A. Shirinyan

courses and having a more prepared academic staff. In particular, some representatives of the academic staff were assessed relatively low in terms of their professional and methodical preparation. By comparing the outcomes of the study and the analysis of this survey, it becomes evident, that the complaints are mainly related to the different interests of the students, the complexity and mastery of some subjects, the assessment approaches of the lecturers, due to which the students assessed the given representatives of the academic staff low. At the same time, some courses and representatives of the academic staff (Armenian History, Biosecurity, Sustainable Development and Ecology) were assessed unsatisfactory or relatively low in all courses, so it is necessary to study the syllabuses of the courses in detail and hold discussions with the heads of the respective chairs. By comparing the obtained outcomes with the ones of the previous years, it became clear that the representatives of the academic staff teaching in IT professional groups S. Harutyunyan and V. Hayrapetyan have always been assessed unsatisfactory, which is why, as a result of not solving the issues raised for years, the need to replace the above-mentioned professors is paramount.

The analysis of the outcomes of the survey also showed that the assessment approaches are not clear for most of the representatives of the academic staff. The subjective factor comes into play especially when assessing students.

Based on the above mentioned outcomes and taking into account the feedbacks of the students, Quality Assurance and Educational Reforms Department suggest the following recommendations:

1. to present the EUA new policy and rubrics on assessment to the academic staff of the chairs,
2. to organize training courses for newly admitted EUA academic staff,
3. to require all the representatives of the academic staff to continue to be consistent in assigning tasks and checking them,
4. to extend class breaks,
5. to make changes in the academic staff,
6. to review the university's approaches to closing doors,
7. to review the requirements to submit individual papers in 3rd and 4th year,

Financial markets, Program budgeting - T. Harutyunyan

Financial control, Business plan, Analytical geometry, Mathematical methods - V. Hayrapetyan

Provision of network applications - S. Harutyunyan

Programs in hourly platforms - S. Petrosyan

Study methods - E. Harutyunyan, G. Manasyan

Algorithm - V. Soghomonyan

Geography - M. Dalalyan

Math analysis - M. Romanov

General management, Strategic management - H. Eroyan

Business English - S. Poghosyan, N. Petrosyan

Project management - M. Detloff

Business law - V. Torosyan

Academic English - T. Kirakosyan

Tour operator activity - H. Danielyan

8. to emphasize practical tasks in educational programs of Service and IT,
9. to replenish the library with the professional literature in Armenian,
10. to improve library computers,
11. to review teaching methods for effective implementation of educational programs.

Thus, the analysis of the outcomes of the survey and the conclusions regarding the students' satisfaction with the process of conducting courses in the full-time education system of the Bachelor's and Master's degrees will be provided to the relevant chairs so that appropriate measures can be taken to solve the identified issues.

Chief Specialist of Quality Assurance

and Educational Reforms Department:

T. Movsisyan, PhD in Pedagogy

December 10, 2023.

Head of Quality Assurance and Educational Reforms Department: K. Sargsyan

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor

Presented at the session N 9 of the Rectorate on December 13, 2023.