

Institution: Medical University - Plovdiv **Field:** Medicine
Department: Faculty of Medicine **Number of cases (invited):** 27 (383)

Index	Mean	Number of cases	Group	Overall mean
Overall learning experience	1,71	26	2	2,30
Quality of courses & teaching	1,96	27	2	2,64
Organisation of program	1,78	27	2	2,41
Contact with teachers	2,23	25	3	2,80
Opportunities to study abroad	1,99	24	2	2,99
Library facilities			no rank group assignable	2,26
IT provision	2,28	25	3	2,58
Room facilities			no rank group assignable	2,31
Research orientation of teaching			no rank group assignable	2,69
Linking clinical/preclinical teaching	1,44	24	2,00	2,30
Skills Labs	1,85	24	3,00	2,33
Bedside teaching	1,56	23	2,00	2,34
Inclusion of practical experience/clerkships	1,64	23	2,00	2,34

1	Very good
2	Good
3	Average
4	Below average
5	Weak
rank group not assignable	The students' opinions do not allow assigning this department to a unique group.
less than 15 answers	The number of responses on this indicator is below 15.
response rate below 10%	The response rate is below 10%.

Medical University - Plovdiv

Quality of courses & teaching	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Ways in which the subject matter is transmitted (didactics)	1,8	2,5	,9	27	88,89%	3,70%
Accompanying material provided with courses	2,0	2,5	1,4	27	81,48%	11,11%
Willingness of staff to enhance their teaching	1,7	2,5	1,0	27	85,19%	3,70%
Breadth of contents of teaching offerings	1,8	2,2	1,0	27	85,19%	3,70%
Adequate teaching of basic courses	1,7	2,3	1,1	27	88,89%	3,70%
International orientation of teaching (literature, research)	1,9	2,4	1,2	27	81,48%	7,41%
Interdisciplinary elements in teaching	1,8	2,4	1,0	27	92,59%	3,70%
Opportunities to choose an individual focus of studies	2,1	2,9	1,4	25	80,00%	8,00%

Organisation of program	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Transparency of entrance requirements/admission regulations	1,8	2,2	1,3	27	88,89%	11,11%
Feasibility of study programme (graduating within the norm period)	1,5	2,1	,8	27	92,59%	,00%
Access to classes (no waiting lists, no overlaps in time)	1,6	2,0	1,1	27	88,89%	7,41%
Adjustment of course content to examination subjects	1,6	2,4	,9	27	88,89%	3,70%
Transparency of the examination system (e.g. criteria, procedures)	2,0	2,5	1,5	27	85,19%	11,11%
Feedback on my work by teachers	1,9	2,6	1,0	27	92,59%	7,41%
Matching of course contents within a programme module	1,6	2,2	1,0	26	88,46%	3,85%

Teacher support	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Social climate between students and teachers	1,6	2,3	1,0	24	91,67%	4,17%
Feedback on homework, assignments and examinations	1,8	2,6	1,1	25	84,00%	4,00%
Advice in preparing theses or oral presentations	2,2	2,4	1,2	25	72,00%	12,00%

Study abroad	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Attractiveness of the exchange programme/partner universities	1,5	2,4	,9	23	86,96%	,00%
Support and advice for studying abroad	1,5	2,7	1,0	22	90,91%	4,55%
Financial support for studying abroad	2,4	3,1	1,8	20	75,00%	25,00%
Recognition of the results obtained during the study abroad period (e.g. Credits)	1,8	2,5	1,4	21	90,48%	9,52%
Support in finding an internship abroad	1,7	2,8	1,1	21	90,48%	4,76%

IT facilities	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Hardware of available computers	2,3	2,4	1,7	25	76,00%	20,00%
Software available	2,1	2,3	1,5	25	76,00%	16,00%
Maintenance of the computers	2,3	2,4	1,6	25	68,00%	20,00%
User support	2,2	2,4	1,6	24	66,67%	12,50%
Open times during lecture weeks	1,9	2,2	1,3	25	80,00%	12,00%
Number of available places during the lecture weeks	2,3	2,4	1,6	25	80,00%	20,00%
Availability of Wifi	2,1	2,3	1,6	25	76,00%	12,00%

Skills Labs	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Maintenance of labs	1,9	2,1	1,3	24	79,17%	12,50%
Capacity	2,0	2,3	1,4	24	83,33%	12,50%
Accessibility	1,6	2,3	1,0	24	87,50%	4,17%
Technical facilities	1,7	2,2	,9	24	91,67%	,00%
Mentoring	1,7	2,3	1,1	24	91,67%	8,33%
Variety of actors simulating sick patients	2,2	2,6	1,8	18	77,78%	16,67%

Inclusion of practical experience/clerkships	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Clarity of learning objectives for the clerkship	1,5	2,3	,9	22	90,91%	4,55%
Opportunity to follow a variety of different patients (with different medical conditions)	1,5	2,2	,9	23	86,96%	,00%
Guidance and feedback by clinical staff	1,8	2,3	1,3	23	86,96%	8,70%
Feedback by faculty members on my performance	1,8	2,5	1,0	23	78,26%	4,35%

Linking clinical/preclinical teaching	Mean	Overall mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Practical relevance of theoretical/pre-clinical courses	1,5	2,3	,8	24	91,67%	,00%

Detailed Analysis UMR Student Survey 2018

Integration of theoretical/basic science and clinical/bed side teaching	1,4	2,3	,6	23	95,65%	,00%
---	-----	-----	----	----	--------	------

Bedside teaching	Mean	Over all mean	Standard deviation	Number of cases	Share good/very good	Share bad/very bad
Mentoring by clinical staff at bedside teaching	1,4	2,3	,8	22	95,45%	4,55%
Suitability of rooms used for bedside teaching	1,7	2,5	,9	23	86,96%	,00%
Variety of diagnostic techniques applied	1,5	2,3	,8	22	95,45%	4,55%