



**ÓBUDAI EGYETEM
ÓBUDA UNIVERSITY**

DOCTORAL TRAINING
Quality assurance plan

Approved by: EDHT ÓE EDHT 2025/2026 (XII.05.) 1.

Date: 2025. 12.05.

BUDAPEST

2025

Table of contents

Introduction	3
General Quality Assurance Criteria.....	3
1.1 Quality assurance policy	4
1.2 and 1.9 Design and approval, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of training programmes	5
1.3 Student-centered learning, teaching, and assessment.....	5
1.4 Student admission, progress, recognition of their studies and award of qualifications ..	7
1.5 Trainers	8
1.6 Learning support and doctoral student services	10
1.7 Information Management	11
1.8 Public information	12
ANNEXES:	12

Introduction

The quality assurance system of the doctoral schools of Óbuda University is based on the provisions of Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, Government Decree 87/2015 (IV.9.) on the implementation of certain provisions of Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, and Government Decree 387/2012 (XII.19.) on doctoral schools, the order of doctoral procedures and habilitation.

It follows the regulations of the Hungarian Higher Education Accreditation Committee on the accreditation procedure of doctoral schools and the principles of modern quality assurance, with special regard to the¹ European Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015) based on the PDCA principle developed by the ministers of the European Higher Education Area (ENQA) under the coordination of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.

General Quality Assurance Criteria

In addition to taking into account the ESG-based provisions of the Institutional Quality Regulations, and taking into account the recommendations of the National Doctoral Council, the DI ensures the fulfilment, control and continuous development of the quality assurance criteria of doctoral school activities in compliance with the following principles. The flow chart of the training and quality assurance activities of the DI is provided in Annex 1.

The basic principles of the quality assurance system of doctoral trainings:

- a) the principle of professional control;
- b) the principle of publicity;
- (c) the principle of feedback;
- d) the principle of individual responsibility;
- e) the principle of documentation;
- (f) the principle of effectiveness;
- g) the principle of practical applicability.

Taking these principles into account, the present quality assurance plan has been developed, which is to be applied uniformly to all doctoral schools operating at Óbuda University.

The operational quality assurance tasks of the DI are organized, coordinated and supervised by the Deputy Head of the DI School Head, who is responsible for making the institutional quality policy known to all internal and external stakeholders. The head of the DI is responsible for the preparation of the DI level annual quality targets based on the quality objectives set by the EDHT, and their approval by the DIT, and monitors the fulfilment of the quality targets, and also ensures that the measurement results are fed back into the operational processes in order to achieve continuous improvement.

The head of the Doctoral School reports annually to the EDHT on the operation of the quality assurance system of the doctoral school, the achievement of the quality policy and the quality objectives, and the results achieved during the developments, on which an annual evaluation report is prepared.

¹ PDCA: Plan-Do-Check-Action

The quality assurance of the doctoral school basically covers two main areas. On the one hand, it continuously monitors the doctoral school training, and on the other hand, it monitors the fulfilment of the quality assurance requirements related to the doctoral degree acquisition procedure, in the course of which it follows and fulfils the ESG 2015 guidelines as set out in the following chapters and in the documents regulating the operation of doctoral schools.

The institutional quality assurance procedures – where it can be interpreted – also include comprehensive criteria for DI, the application of which at the DI level is the responsibility of the deputy head of school, secretary and head of DI.

In the institutional quality assurance organization – the Quality Committee – the DI is represented through the President of the EDHT. The person of the President of the EDHT is a guarantee that up-to-date communication of matters and information related to quality assurance can be ensured between the institution and the DI.

1.1 Quality assurance policy, external quality assurance

In the case of DIs, the institutional Quality Policy document is also authoritative. The provisions of the Decree also cover the specifics of doctoral training. The University has an independent public quality assurance policy (Annex 2), in the development and implementation of which and in the revision of the Institutional Development Plan of the University as necessary, but at least at the same time as the modification of the University's Institutional Development Plan, it involves, as far as possible, both internal (students, lecturers and non-teaching staff) and external stakeholders (users, employers, cooperating partners). Quality policy reflects the close link between research and learning and teaching. Quality policy is part of the institutional quality culture, it is a document with formal status and is publicly available.

The quality policy also provides a framework for the quality goals of the DI, which are closely linked to the University's Institutional Development Plan, and are adopted by the DIT with regard to the quality goals of the EDHT. Further details on the definition of quality targets, their annual evaluation and the determination of the necessary measures related to them are described in Chapter 1.7.

The quality policy of the University is also reviewed by the University Doctoral and Habilitation Council, and participates in its systematic review and development.. The quality policy is made available to all interested parties on the website of the University and the DIs, as well as in the usual manner and places within the institution.

The quality assurance activities of the DI are organized along the ESG criteria, in close synergy with the quality assurance system implemented within the framework of the institutional TQM model, which is also reviewed annually internally and by an external party (MAB) at the frequency specified in the accreditation decision. The internal review will be carried out within the framework of a self-evaluation based on the HAC's criteria for doctoral schools, which will form the basis of the self-evaluation prepared for the accreditation procedure by the HAC. The DI reviews the regulations relating to its operation as necessary, but at least every two years, in order to ensure consistency with any changing legal and other institutional regulations. The management and updating of the documents of the DI is ensured by the deputy head of the DI school responsible for the performance of the operational tasks of the DI. The DI does not participate in any quality verification procedure other than the MAB accreditation procedure.

1.2 and 1.9 Design and approval, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of training programmes

The DI takes care of the development and approval of its training programs at its own discretion. The primary goal of the training programmes is to ensure that doctoral students are capable of performing high-quality scientific work. To this end, they acquire the ability to process the literature at an analytical and synthesizing scientific level, as well as to plan and carry out primary and secondary research. Another requirement is to learn and use scientific methodology and its application in research work. The doctoral student must demonstrate these skills and abilities by preparing and defending the doctoral dissertation (or, in the case of DLA, by documenting and presenting the master's thesis). The acquisition of these skills is supported by the study units recorded in the Curriculum of the Faculty of Economics and the descriptions of the subjects, which clearly record the expected learning outcomes and which are reviewed by the Faculty of Economics and Communications Officer every two years.

During the development and revision of the Training Plan, the opinions and feedback of both the doctoral student and the lecturer, but also of the external partners involved (labour market actors, research institutes, partner institutions, etc.) are taken into account, which are collected and processed regularly and in a planned manner by the DI in the framework of questionnaire surveys and/or focus group interviews (3. – 6. annex). The opinions and comments of external partners are also requested at various exam and other professional events (complex exams, workshop discussions, public defences, professional forums, workshops, doctoral conferences, etc.) – using a questionnaire, which is coordinated by the deputy head of school/secretary of the DI – which are also taken into account by the DIT during the development of the training.

Complex exam results also play an important role as an indicator in the development of the Training Plan. The performance of doctoral students in the complex exam is evaluated by the DIT during the annual performance evaluation and may initiate the modification of the Training Plan if necessary (modernization and updating of the curriculum, modification of the range of subjects, etc.).

When developing the Training Plan, the primary aspect is to compile the course offer in such a way that the smooth progress of the doctoral students can be ensured, and the expected loads are clearly recorded in terms of credits. The announcement of subjects in Neptun every semester is handled flexibly by the DI, taking into account the needs of the students. The Training Plan is approved by the DIT.

The Training Plan is published on the website of the Faculty of Economics. The research topics are also described in the Training Plan, for the announcement of which the DI applies a uniform procedure in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of Operation

The development and approval, continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of the training programme and research topics of the Faculty of Economics shall be governed by the Regulations of Operation of the Faculty of Economics.

1.3 Student-centered learning, teaching, and assessment

During the development and implementation of the training programs of the Faculty of Education, the conditions for the implementation of student-centered learning, teaching and assessment are in the focus. In doing so, the DI takes into account the diversity of doctoral students and their needs, allowing them flexible learning paths; Whenever possible, it expects different teaching methods from educators who use different pedagogical methods. Doctoral students are typically trained individually or in small groups, in a consultativemanner. In the case of basic subjects, it is typical to hold classes according to a larger timetable.

The DI ensures appropriate guidance and support from the lecturers; it promotes the development of mutual respect in the student-teacher relationship and places special emphasis on student-friendly supervision, namely the regular reconciliation of mutual expectations between the doctoral student and the supervisor. The DI also expects its supervisors to make the criteria for progress clear to the doctoral students, and to formulate them together and to keep them under supervision. The DI strives to develop a student-centered timetable/hold classes. The DI ensures the handling of doctoral students' complaints and the operation of a legal remedy forum in accordance with the institutional procedures. In the handling of student complaints, the student also participates in the correct case management through the representative of the Student Union. In order to meet all these expectations, the needs and expectations of doctoral students related to doctoral training, as well as their general satisfaction, are assessed by the DI once per academic year, in the framework of an anonymous online questionnaire survey or in the framework of focus group interviews (Appendix 4). The method of the survey is chosen depending on the number of people in which the measurement takes place, and the condition of anonymity can be ensured. The DIT evaluates the results of the assessment/interview – which is prepared by the Deputy Head of School/Secretary of the DI School – during the annual performance evaluation and decides on the necessary improvements. It provides information on the development/action plans to stakeholders (feedback).

With regard to the evaluation of studies, the DI expects the lecturers to use a variety of examination methods as far as possible; the criteria and methods of evaluation are made public in advance, at the beginning of the course; and it is an important expectation that the evaluation objectively reflects the extent to which the doctoral student has acquired the intended learning outcomes.

The Doctoral Students are provided with the active participation in educational activities in accordance with the Operating Regulations. In addition to the supervisor, the person responsible for the subject taught decides on the evaluation of these activities, taking into account the student's opinion on the teaching work of the doctoral student, which is to be understood as part of the OMHV.

The DI strives to ensure, where possible, that the assessment is carried out by more than one examiner; Evaluation is applied consistently and fairly to all doctoral students, in accordance with a uniform procedure established at institutional level. All doctoral students are provided with the opportunity to formally appeal the evaluation. Further details of student-centred learning, teaching and assessment in the DI are laid down in the DI Operational Rules and the DI Training Plan.

1.4 Student admission, progress, recognition of their studies and award of qualifications

The Operating Regulations of the Doctoral School have a pre-defined and published procedure covering the entire life cycle of a doctoral student with regard to the admission of doctoral students, their progression, the recognition of their studies and the award of qualifications, which are consistently applied. The DIT continuously evaluates the progress of the doctoral student in the doctoral training – in accordance with his or her own research plan – and at the same time the performance of the supervisor.

At the end of each semester, the supervisor will make a written statement about the performance and research progress ~~of the~~ doctoral student ~~—~~ on the basis of which credits will be awarded, with special regard to the publication activity and the research work required for the writing of the thesis .

The supervisor sends the interim report on the doctoral student's scientific performance to the DIT in electronic form, where it is evaluated and archived. The doctoral student and the supervisor will receive electronic feedback from the DIT on the results of the evaluation and any necessary development proposals.

Depending on the results of the periodic qualification, the DIT will make a proposal to modify the supervisor if necessary, possibly to involve a co-supervisor or to reclassify the state-funded doctoral student into self-financed training. Such cases are supervised by the DIT with special attention.

The doctoral student reports on the results of his or her work annually at a public doctoral conference. The other doctoral students, their supervisors, members of the DIT and invited external experts will participate. The essence of the presentation at the conference is to assess the progress of the doctoral student and to get acquainted with his or her further research plans. More details in Chapter 1.6.

In the case of individual students, the control of the conditions for entry to doctoral training falls within the competence of the DIT. The expectations and procedures for individual preparers are laid down in the Operational Regulations and the Training Plan of the DI.

The DI supports student mobility and ensures the performance of other institutions or external professional organizations that can be taken into account in doctoral training, with the fact that 30 working hours means the value of 1 credit.

In the case of performances provided in this way, the DIT examines the content of the subject requirement on the basis of the submitted application (studies completed at another institution can be admitted in case of 75% agreement), and reviews the vocational education and other practical performance, and then decides on its acceptance or rejection. Details on this are provided in the Learning Path.

The DIT places special emphasis on the monitoring of the scientific performance necessary for the initiation of the degree acquisition procedure of the doctoral student. The doctoral student can prove his/her research performance primarily through his/her publication and patent activities, the management of which is primarily the responsibility of the supervisors. The specific requirements related to the evaluation of publication and patent performance are included in the

Training Path. The DIT and the EDHT check the fulfilment of these requirements when applying for the degree.

During the doctoral training, at the end of the fourth semester or, if the prescribed study requirements are met, at the end of the second semester at the earliest, at the end of the fourth semester at the latest, a complex exam must be passed at the end of the training and research phase and as a condition for the commencement of the research and dissertation phase, which measures and evaluates the academic and research progress. After the complex exam, the student participates in the degree acquisition procedure by completing the research and dissertation phases. A doctoral student who has obtained the required credits in the doctoral program will be issued a final certificate (absolutorium).

The condition for initiating the degree acquisition procedure is the submission of the relevant application and its annexes to the DIT (in accordance with the Rules of Operation). Based on the application, the DIT decides on its acceptance.

Graduation is the culmination of studies when doctoral students receive appropriate documents describing what qualifications they have obtained, including the learning outcomes achieved and the context, level, content and status of the studies pursued and successfully completed. The detailed rules for this are laid down in the Rules of Operation.

The further procedures applied in the Doctoral Student Union in connection with the admission and progression, recognition of their studies and the awarding of qualifications, including individual preparations, are set out in detail in the Operating Regulations.

1.5 Trainers

The DI places special emphasis on ensuring that the core members, instructors and supervisors have the appropriate competencies and that their continuous development is realized. The suitability of the core members, lecturers and supervisors of the DI and the up-to-date status of the relevant data on the ODT interface is checked and reviewed annually during the performance evaluation, based on the provisions of the relevant government decree and the rules of the EDHSZ. In the event of a deficiency or any non-compliance, it shall immediately initiate action for rectification-

The teachers and topic announcers of the DI can be lecturers and researchers with a scientific degree and continuous scientific performance, who are considered suitable by the DIT to perform teaching, research and supervisory tasks within the framework of the DI.

The lecturer or topic announcer of the Doctoral Programme may be a full-time employee of a domestic or foreign research institution, university, company or other institution with a scientific degree, who is a certified professional with high-quality practical experience (external lecturer) and who has been approved by the Faculty of Science. Furthermore, a consultant may participate in the supervision of a consultant who is a professional (external instructor) with a proven high level of practical experience (but does not have a knowledge degree) and who is considered suitable by the DIT to perform the task, in which case a lecturer with a scientific degree is a lecturer of the DI will be involved as a co-supervisor. The teachers of the doctoral school appear in the school's ODT database, and if someone teaches in more than one doctoral school, they declare on the ODT data sheet what percentage they belong to which doctoral school.

A supervisor may not have more than six doctoral students who have not obtained more than six absolutions at the same time, which includes a doctoral student led in any doctoral school. In the case of co-supervisors, a student must be counted with a factor of 0.5. In order to monitor the quality of teaching activities and supervisor activities at the Faculty of Education, the Doctoral Student's opinion on the teaching work (OMHV) and the supervisory activity is carried out each semester in the framework of an online questionnaire survey or focus group interviews (Appendix 5), in order to ensure that the Doctoral Students' opinions contribute to the improvement and development of the quality of teaching and supervision at the Faculty of Education, as well as the efficiency of the training. The assessment of the work of the instructors contributes to the exploration and elimination of possible errors and deficiencies, and ultimately to the continuous development of educational activities. In possession of this information, it is possible for the DI to initiate interventions at the necessary points (regarding the development of pedagogical, methodological, etc. knowledge) in order to ensure an ever-higher quality, continuously developing doctoral training.

Doctoral students in a doctoral student who is in a doctoral relationship with the Faculty of Economics and Vocational Sciences, and the subject director and lecturer of the Faculty of Economics may be entitled to evaluate the work of the lecturer and give an opinion.

The evaluation of doctoral students provides an objective picture of the standard and quality of education at the Master's Degree Programme. The reviewer cannot be disadvantaged in any way for the instructor qualification, the head of the DI gives a guarantee for this.

The doctoral student's review of the teaching work covers:

- a) the standard and quality of education;
- b) the curriculum taught;
- c) scientific methods of education;
- d) the material and technical conditions of education;
- e) the relationship between teachers and doctoral students;
- f) other aspects determining the quality of education.

The results of the questionnaires/interviews are processed by the deputy head of the school / secretary of the Faculty of Education, who forwards the results to the head of the Faculty of Education. The head of the Student Union will give feedback on the results of the evaluation to the lecturers and initiate measures if necessary, and also to the doctoral students through the representative of the Student Union. All course directors and lecturers who have been reviewed have the right to have access to the aggregate results of the evaluations concerning them at the head of the Faculty of Education. Based on the results of the questionnaire survey, the best lecturer participating in the PhD/DLA programme can be awarded the "Lecturer of the Year" award, which is decided by the DIT leader taking into account the opinion of the DIT. In the case of instructors who have received an unfavourable evaluation (below a value of 3), the DI leader initiates a consultation with the instructor concerned regarding possible development measures. The DI leader will provide information about the result to the DIT.

The DI also monitors the opinion and satisfaction of its lecturers and topic announcers, which it asks for annually in the course of an online questionnaire survey (Annex 6) within the framework of a formal procedure. The Deputy Head of School/Secretary of the DI takes care of the organization and implementation of the questionnaire survey. The received answers are processed

and forwarded to the DIT, where a decision is made on possible improvements. Colleagues receive feedback on the results of these meetings through internal communication forums (departmental or institute meetings, intranet, etc.).

Further regulations governing instructors and supervisors are laid down in the Operating Regulations of the Faculty of Education .

1.6 Learning support and doctoral student services

The professionally autonomous organizational unit under the direct management of the Rector of the University has adequate funding sources for the provision of learning and teaching activities, as well as provides adequate and easily accessible learning support conditions and student services for its doctoral students. The resources for this are provided to the DI partly by the faculty that provides the DI – if clearly identified and named – within its operational framework, and partly by using the DI's own operational resources.

The M.Sc. continuously strives to offer a variety of up-to-date background support for learning in order to make the doctoral student's study time feel successful. These are partly infrastructural, from laboratories and libraries through learning facilities to IT tools and systems, and partly human, from tutors to counsellors, academic administration and other support professionals alike.

The preparedness of the support and administrative staff plays a fundamental role in the provision of services, so the DI pays special attention to employing staff with appropriate qualifications and language skills. At the Faculty of Education, an administrator with main administrative tasks and the Deputy Head of School/Secretary of the Faculty of Economics are at the disposal of the doctoral students to manage their affairs in Hungarian and English.

The representation of the interests of the students of the Student Union is ensured through the representative of the Student Union. Furthermore, the management of the DI considers it important that the interests of the students can also be enforced during the planning and evaluation of the DI's operational processes, therefore the DIT also has one main member delegated by the DIK with the right of consultation.

The DI promotes and supports the international mobility of doctoral students, and also offers various scholarships, conference participation opportunities and publication opportunities for its doctoral students, about which it provides information through various internal communication channels (email, intranet, website, bulletin board, etc.) used by the institution.

Every year, the DI organizes a Doctoral Conference in Hungarian and English, in the framework of which the doctoral students give a presentation on their scientific results and further research plans in front of a committee appointed by the DIT. Former doctoral students who have obtained a degree at the Doctoral School are also invited to the Doctoral Conference, i.e. an ALUMNI meeting is also connected to the scientific event. We pay great attention to nurturing relationships with graduated doctoral students within the framework of the ALUMNI program. The registration of graduated doctoral students is carried out by the Deputy Head of School/Secretary of the Faculty of Education.

Doctoral students are also provided with the conditions for handling various applications and complaints, in this regard the provisions of the University Doctoral and Habilitation Regulations and the Institutional Student Requirements.

Any questions of scientific ethics that may arise must be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Ethics of Óbuda University.

The DI provides the supporting activities and its facilities to its doctoral students under the conditions and conditions provided by the infrastructure of the University.

1.7 Information Management

The DI regularly collects, analyzes, and evaluates relevant information to guide its training programs and other activities. The current quality goals of the DI are summarized in a separate document entitled Quality Goals (Annex 7), which also serves as a source of information on the indicators that can be used to evaluate the performance of the DI. The quality objectives of the Labour Market are defined in a manner that can be derived from the institutional strategy and are closely aligned with the strategy of the Vocational Education and Industry, taking into account the results of the annual performance evaluation. The DI prepares its strategy with the involvement of internal and external stakeholders min. 3, for a maximum period of 5 years, which will be discussed and approved by the DIT.

In order to make fact-based decisions and to know how efficiently each process works, what needs to be paid attention to, where it is necessary to intervene and develop, reliable data must be available.

Effective information gathering and analysis processes for programmes and other activities are part of the internal quality assurance system, which are the following sources of information:

- The basic performance indicators (teaching staff, training effectiveness, complex exams, graduation results, etc.);
- the composition of the students (applicants, admitted, form of training, work schedule, form of financing, individual preparation, etc.);
- the progress of doctoral students, their success rates and dropout rates;
- the satisfaction of doctoral students with the training programmes, lecturers and supervisor;
- the available learning background support and student counselling;
- the career path/career path of graduates;
- Instructor satisfaction;
- satisfaction of non-teaching staff;
- external partner opinions, satisfaction.

These data and information primarily contribute to the evaluation of the quality goals of the DI, which are carried out by the DIT on an annual basis (Appendix 8). The DIT makes the results available to stakeholders in the usual way on the spot, and ensures that further necessary measures and new quality targets for the next period are defined.

The DI uses various methods to collect and process data in the manner described in the previous chapters, and these processes are mainly carried out in the framework of questionnaire surveys. The coordination of data collection at the level of the DI is primarily the task of the DI secretary/operational director, who performs his or her related activities in cooperation and under the guidance of the institutional quality assurance officer. Doctoral students, lecturers and non-teaching staff, as well as external stakeholders (labour market actors, guest lecturers, representatives of partner institutions, professional organisations, etc.) will be involved in the data collection. The management, analysis and feedback of the available data to the appropriate points of the operational processes is the responsibility and competence of the head of the DI.

1.8 Public information


The availability of up-to-date information on the activities, results and future objectives of the DI is useful and necessary for future and current doctoral students, as well as for graduates, other stakeholders and the public.

To this end, the MSc provides information on its activities, training programmes, admission requirements, expected learning outcomes, qualifications to be obtained, teaching, learning and assessment procedures, success rates, as well as learning opportunities offered to doctoral students and the employment of graduates.

The DI basically ensures the publication of clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information through its website, as well as the publication of DI documents in Hungarian and English. In addition, the National Doctoral Council publishes the information required for it on the doktori.hu interface on its public interface, which you update at least a year. The management of the communication interfaces of the DI is the task of the deputy head of the school of the DI under the supervision of the head of the DI and, if necessary, with the approval of the head of the DI. With regard to the management of the public information of the DI and data protection, attention must be paid to the relevant institutional procedures.

ANNEXES:

1. ANNEX: Flowchart of DI's training and quality assurance activities
2. ANNEX: Quality policy
3. ANNEX: External Partner Satisfaction Questionnaire
4. ANNEX: Doctoral student needs and satisfaction survey
5. ANNEX: Doctoral student opinion of teaching work and Supervisor work
6. ANNEX: Teacher/researcher satisfaction survey questionnaire
7. ANNEX: Quality Objectives - Template
8. ANNEX: Aspects of the DI Annual Performance Evaluation – Template



QUALITY POLICY

As an active and recognized player in the global higher education market, Óbuda University is one of the leading universities in Hungarian higher education in technology and economics. The focus of our activities is on the student. Our goal is to ensure the domestic and international competitiveness and professional recognition of the institution with our reliable, high-quality educational, research and other service activities. Our basic mission is to serve society, the economy and industrial partners through the transfer and development of knowledge at a high level and in a modern way and with our continuously expanding innovations.

In order to implement the strategy of becoming an internationally acclaimed, innovative, sustainable investment university, the management of the university is committed to creating a quality culture based on the principles of Total Quality Management, during which it also pays special attention to the enforcement of sustainability aspects in accordance with the contents of the so-called "Green University Program". The University carries out its higher education activities within the framework of the quality assurance system in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), the validity of which extends to doctoral education in addition to graduate studies. As part of the institutional quality culture, the University also ensures that the Salzburg principles are enforced in relation to doctoral training.

With the development of this student-centered higher education model that responds to environmental and social changes, has an innovative and sustainable investment approach, is constantly renewed, multifaceted, and recognizes excellent student talents, our goal is to produce highly qualified engineers, IT specialists, mathematicians, economists, engineering teachers and PhD/DLA doctors with marketable knowledge, who are the hallmark of the knowledge acquired at Óbuda University in the domestic and international labor market.

We strive to operate and continuously develop a networked, cross-border university covering the Carpathian Basin, using modern educational methods that meet the needs of the 21st century, providing high-quality practice-oriented training, which provides high-level higher education vocational training, bachelor's and doctoral training, as well as research, development and innovation activities at an international level, which largely satisfies the expectations of our industrial partners, in a constantly renewing infrastructure environment. The goal is to stabilize our position at the top of the world, and to further expand and strengthen our international positions.

The management of the Institute strives to continuously develop the quality and sustainability-centred thinking of the university citizens, furthermore, to make the commitment to quality and sustainability an inner motivation for all employees, to continuously expand their knowledge and knowledge by demonstrating increased standards in their lifestyle and work, and to strengthen their ownership approach.

Quality assurance plan

The management of the University expects all its students and staff – including those who carry out outsourced activities within the framework of commissions – to contribute to the success and effective operation of the University with their personal knowledge and responsibility.

The university supports academic integrity and freedom, the fight against all forms of intolerance, discrimination and fraud affecting its citizens, and ensures the extensive involvement of external stakeholders in quality improvement processes.

Budapest, 2025. 8 September

Prof. Dr. Kovács Levente

Principal

KÜLSŐ PARTNER ELÉGEDETTSÉGI FELMÉRÉS

A vizsgálat célja annak felmérése, hogy a társadalom, a munkaerőpiac, mint külső partner hogyan értékeli az Óbudai Egyetem Doktori Iskola oktatási rendszerét és az általa kibocsátott tudományos szakembereket.

Kérjük, hogy a kérdőív kitöltésével járuljon hozzá a doktori képzés minőségének fejlesztéséhez!
Értékelje a kérdéseket 1-től 6-ig terjedő skálán: (1 - egyáltalán nem megfelelő, 2 - nem megfelelő, 3 - inkább nem megfelelő, 4 - inkább megfelelő, 5 - megfelelő, 6 - teljes mértékben megfelelő)!
Ha nincs információja, akkor "N", ha nem akar válaszolni, akkor: "X" jelet írjon!

1.	Mennyire igazodik a DI képzési kínálata a munkaerő piaci igényekhez?	
2.	Mennyire tartja színvonalasnak a DI szakmai-tudományos tevékenységét?	
3.	Milyennek itéli a DI tudományos elismertségét?	
4.	Mennyire tartja meghatározónak a DI szerepét a hazai doktori képzésben?	
5.	Mennyire tartja meghatározónak a DI szerepét a nemzetközi doktori képzésben?	
6.	Mennyire elégedett a DI hallgatójának elméleti felkészültségével?	
7.	Milyennek itéli a DI hallgatójának kutatási ambícióját?	
8.	Milyennek itéli a DI hallgatójának tudományos teljesítményét?	
9.	Milyennek itéli a DI oktatóinak képzési teljesítményét?	
10.	Milyennek itéli a DI hallgatóinak elhelyezkedési lehetőségeit?	
11.	Milyennek itéli a DI követelményrendszerét?	
12.	Milyennek itéli a DI nyilvános felületeken való megjelenését?	
13.	Milyennek itéli a DI-ben a hallgató-témavezető kapcsolat hatékonyságát?	
14.	Milyennek itéli a DI-ben a doktori iskola vezető hatékonyságát az iskola vezetésében?	
15.	Milyennek itéli a DI-ben a doktori iskola vezető szakmai elismertségét?	

Milyen fejlesztési javaslatok, egyéb megjegyzései vannak a doktori képzés minőségének fejlesztése érdekében?

Az Ön szervezete¹: versenyszféra – gazdálkodó szervezet, társintézmény, kutatóintézet, szakmai szervezet, egyéb:

¹ kérjük aláhúzni a megfelelő választ

Köszönjük együttműködését!

4. ANNEX

DOKTORANDUSZI IGÉNY- ÉS ELÉGEDETTSÉG FELMÉRÉS

Kérjük, hogy a kérdőív kitöltésével járuljon hozzá a PhD képzés minőségi fejlesztéséhez!
Értékelje a kérdéseket 1-től 6-ig terjedő skálán: (1 - egyáltalán nem, 2 - nem megfelelően, 3 - inkább nem megfelelően, 4 - inkább megfelelően, 5 - megfelelően, 6 - teljes mértékben)!

Ha nincs információja, akkor "N", ha nem akar válaszolni, akkor: "X" jelet írjon!

1.	Mennyire elégedett a képzés színvonalával?	
2.	Mennyire elégedett az oktatókkal való kapcsolattartási lehetőségekkel?	
3.	Mennyire elégedett azokkal a lehetőségekkel, amelyeket az egyetem/DI kínál a hazai és nemzetközi tudományos életbe való bekapcsolódáshoz (pl. konferenciárészvétel, publikációs lehetőségek, más egyetemen/kutatóintézetben történő részképzés/kutatás)?	
4.	A képzési és kutatási szakaszban előírt tanulmányi kötelezettségeket mennyire találja megfelelőnek?	
5.	Mennyire elégedett az oktatási tevékenység szervezésével?	
6.	Mennyire elégedett a kurzuskínálattal?	
7.	Mennyire tartja korszerűnek az alkalmazott oktatási módszereket?	
8.	Mennyire tartja használhatónak az oktatás során alkalmazott tananyagokat, tansegédleteket?	
9.	Mennyire elégedett a tanszéki munkába való bekapcsolódás lehetőségével?	
10.	Mennyire elégedett az oktatási kredit megszerezhetőségének feltételeivel?	
11.	Mennyire elégedett a doktoranduszok számára biztosított irodai és irodatechnikai ellátottsággal?	
12.	Mennyire elégedett a kutatáshoz szükséges infrastruktúrával, tárgyi eszközökkel (számítógépek, egyéb laboreszközök stb.)?	
13.	Mennyire elégedett a könyvtári infrastruktúra és szolgáltatás színvonalával?	
14.	Mennyire elégedett a DI tanulmányi adminisztrációs ügyintézésével?	
15.	Mennyire elégedett a DI-ben alkalmazott panaszkezelési eljárásrenddel?	
16.	Mennyire elégedett a DI honlapon megjelenő információk naprakészségével?	
17.	Mennyire elégedett a DI működésével kapcsolatos szabályzatokkal (működési, képzési, minőségbiztosítási)? Megkapja-e azokból a szükséges információkat a PhD követelmények teljesíthetőségével kapcsolatban?	
18.	Mennyire elégedett a PhD cselekmény során nyújtott teljesítményeivel kapcsolatos visszajelzésekkel? (beszámolók, workshopok, komplex vizsga, műhelyvita stb.)	
19.	Mennyire elégedett a hallgatók tájékoztatásával a külföldi tanulmányi, kutatási, publikációs lehetőségekkel kapcsolatban (mobilitás)?	
20.	Mennyire elégedett a hallgatói érdekképviseléssel (DÖK)?	

Mit tekint a DI legfőbb erősségeinek?

Mit változtatna a hallgatói elégedettség javítása érdekében? Milyen fejlesztési javaslatok lennének a DI számára?

Tagozat:	nappali	levelező	egyéni felkészülő
Finanszírozási mód:	állami	önköltséges	
Neme:	férfi	nő	

Köszönjük együttműködését!

5. ANNEX

STUDENT REVIEW OF TEACHING WORK

We would like to draw the attention of our reviewing students to the fact that the questionnaire is handled anonymously, which is exclusively part of the quality assurance system of the Doctoral School.

Name of the reviewed instructor:

Subjects taught:

What percentage of classes were you attending?

- 0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

What percentage of the classes were held?

- 0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

What percentage of the classes did the lecturer in charge of the course hold?

- 0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%

Please comment on the following questions and typical aspects on a scale of 1-5. (1, if not at all, and 5, if very typical of the instructor or the subject taught. Please mark it with 0 if you cannot decide, you have no opinion or if the question is not relevant.)

Question / Aspect	1	2	3	4	5	0
1. The instructor's preparedness, professional credibility and up-to-dateness:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. How do you think the instructor's explanatory skills and logical outlines are: were the lessons attention-grabbing, interesting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. How helpful is the teacher: what is his attitude to student requests?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. To what extent did the given subject provide a higher level of knowledge in the PhD programme than the subject with the same title or similar content completed during your previous studies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. To what extent did the lecturer address the research characteristics of the given discipline during the teaching of the subject?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. To what extent did the instructor provide the curriculum necessary for the completion of the subject (aids, notes, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Fulfillment of requirements: if there was a written exam, to what extent were the questions asked in accordance with the submitted or marked curriculum?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Fulfillment of requirements: to what extent were the questions asked in the oral exam in accordance with the submitted or indicated curriculum? (Was the instructor curious about what the student knew or rather what he didn't know?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. The general atmosphere of the oral exam: human, emotional factors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. To what extent can the curriculum of the lessons be used in the researcher's/teacher's work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. To what extent were the determination of the exam requirements, the examination and the grade received?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. What is your overall impression of the subject you are reviewing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. What is your overall impression of the reviewed instructor?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other notes and additions:

SUPERVISOR THESIS STUDENT REVIEW

We would like to inform the doctoral student that the questionnaire will be treated anonymously, which is exclusively part of the quality assurance system of the Doctoral School.

Name of the reviewed supervisor:

1. The supervisor for whom the questionnaire is filled in

- Sole supervisor
- co-supervisor

2. What phase of your doctoral thesis are you in at the moment?

- Training – research phase
- Research – dissertation phase

3. In what form of training do you continue your doctoral thesis?

- state-granted, full-time, full-time organized training;
- self-financed, full-time full-time organized training;
- self-financed, part-time, correspondence organized training.
- state-supported "Cooperative Doctoral Training" with additional scholarships is self-financed

4. He chose his supervisor because:

- is a nationally/internationally recognized expert in his/her chosen research topic
- a recognized professional within the chosen research institution
- appreciates it humanly
- appointed by the doctoral school
- Other:.....

5. Characteristics of the choice of supervisor and supervisor:

- I was looking for a supervisor for my planned topic
- I was looking for a topic for the selected supervisor
- The topic and the supervisor came together

6. Prior to your admission to the doctoral program, what characterized your relationship with your supervisor?

- Previously, I was my supervisor for my major and/or diploma thesis, and we also planned to continue together
- I chose a supervisor for my topic through the ODT interface
- I got in touch with my supervisor through a recommendation
- The doctoral school recommended a supervisor for my topic
- Other:.....

7. How often do you consult your supervisor?

- once a week
- at least once a month
- at least once a quarter
- at least once per semester

- less than half a year
- occasionally

8. What characterizes your personal relationship with your supervisor?

- formal, formal
- Direct, helpful, friendly
- authoritative but useful
- Cooperation is particularly unpleasant
- Other:.....

9. How effective do you feel your supervisor's contribution to your own career is?

- It helps a lot, has a supportive effect and motivates
- He supports me, but does not follow me and holds me strictly accountable for my work
- He supports me, follows me very strictly and holds me accountable for my work
- less supportive
- Not supported

10. Evaluation by your supervisor

- realistic, based on my real performance
- exaggerated, it values me higher than the amount of work I put into
- undervalued, it takes less than I put in the work
- I don't usually appreciate

11. Supervisor's feedback

- It helps my further development, because I get concrete points of reference for the areas to be developed
- I only get a general assessment without identifying areas for improvement
- I'm not getting feedback

What do you consider the most positive about your supervisor's work:

What do you consider the most negative about your supervisor's work:

Thank you for your answers!

6. ANNEX

OKTATÓ-KUTATÓ MUNKATÁRSI ELÉGEDETTSÉG ÉRTÉKELÉSE

A vizsgálat célja az oktató-kutató munkatársak elégedettségének felmérése.

Kérjük a munkatársakat (oktatók, kutatók), hogy a kérdőív kitöltésével járuljanak hozzá a minőség fejlesztéséhez!

Értékelje a kérdéseket 1-től 6-ig terjedő skálán:

(1 - egyáltalán nem megfelelő, 2 - nem megfelelő, 3 - inkább nem megfelelő,
4 - inkább megfelelő, 5 - megfelelő, 6 - teljes mértékben megfelelő)!

Ha nincs információja, akkor "N", ha nem akar válaszolni, akkor: "X" jelet írjon!

1.	Milyennek ítéli a DI-ben betöltött feladataival szemben támasztott követelményeket?	
2.	Mennyire érzi tervezettnek a DI működési folyamatait?	
3.	Mennyire érzi összehangoltnak és átláthatónak a DI-ben zajló folyamatokat?	
4.	Mennyire elégedett a DI által nyújtott támogatásokkal oktatói/témavezetői/egyéb feladatai ellátásához?	
5.	Mennyire elégedett a személyes előmeneteléhez kapott támogatással a DI részéről?	
6.	Mennyire elégedett a DI-ben alkalmazott kommunikációval?	
7.	Mennyire elégedett a DI minőségpolitikájáról kapott tájékoztatással?	
8.	Mennyire elégedett a DI minőségcéljairól kapott tájékoztatással?	
9.	Mennyire elégedett a DI szabályzataival?	
10.	Mennyire elégedett a DI adminisztrációs ügyintézési mechanizmusával?	
11.	Mennyire veszik figyelembe egyedi igényeit a DI képzési tevékenységeinek tervezése során?	
12.	Mennyire tartja hatékonnak az OMHV rendszert?	
13.	Mennyire tartja megfelelőnek a DI képzéshez rendelkezésre álló infrastrukturális felszereltséget?	

Mivel elégedett leginkább a DI-ben végzett munkáját illetően?

Mit változtatna, fejlesztené a munkatársi elégedettség javítása céljából?

Ön jelenleg milyen státuszban van a DI-ban: oktató, kutató témakiíró, témavezető tisztag

Hány éve dolgozik az ÖE-n? <2 év 2-5 év 6-10 év több, mint 10 éve

Neme: férfi nő

Köszönjük együttműködését!

**Quality goals school year
.....Doctoral School**

Strategic goal/task	Quality goal	Indicator/Target	Note

Date:

Created by:

Approved by:

..... **Doctoral School – Performance Evaluation**

Annual report

..... **school year**

Evaluation criteria (proposals):

1. Back-checking and evaluating the fulfilment of the previous year's quality targets, based on the results of which new quality targets are set
2. Analysis of the number of doctoral students (data on the number of applicants, admitted, enrolled, etc.)
3. Doctoral students who are taking a complex exam, requesting an absolutorium, are in a degree acquisition procedure/have obtained a degree in the current year, results (factually), dropouts
4. Change of supervisor/co-supervisor involvement, topic modifications
5. Habilitation procedures and their effectiveness
6. Results of doctoral student needs and satisfaction surveys, e.g. questionnaire survey, workshop, roundtable discussions, results of individual interviews, feedback
7. Analysis of HR staff (core members, supervisors, topic announcers, course directors, lecturers), changes (entry and exit), new core members/instructors, succession planning
8. Statistical analysis and evaluation of teachers' MTMT results
9. Student publication performance based on MTMT
10. Checking the updating of the ODT interface of the DI core member/teacher/supervisor staff
11. If there were any, the results of needs and satisfaction surveys, e.g. questionnaire surveys, workshops, roundtable discussions, results of individual interviews, feedback
12. Partnerships (domestic, international), with whom and in what ways the DI has cooperated, whether there are new relationships, etc.
13. Results of partner relations (domestic, international) needs and satisfaction surveys, e.g. questionnaire surveys, workshops, roundtable discussions, results of individual interviews, feedback
14. Review of the infrastructure and website content (Hungarian-English), e.g. the state of the research and office technology infrastructure provided for doctoral students, the developments and expansions achieved, the completeness and up-to-date nature of the information on the website
15. Evaluation of events, events, workshops, annual doctoral conferences organized by the DI, etc.
16. Results of ALUMNI activities
17. Financial effectiveness: income, expenses, financial support provided to doctoral students and lecturers to finance the activities carried out within the framework of the DI, e.g. participation in conferences, publication support, other

Based on the annual evaluation carried out according to these aspects, the annual Action Plan is prepared (see the sample on the next page), in which the DI can monitor the tasks ahead of it and their fulfillment year by year, and this is how the PDCA model can be enforced during the activities.

Date:

Created by:

Approved by:

Action plan

Purpose	Task	Responsible	Deadline	Verification of fulfillment	Note

Date:

Created by:

Approved by: