



SUB-POLICY ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS

This sub-policy describes CBS' work with student evaluations and how it is linked to the CBS quality policy and quality assurance system. First, CBS's teaching evaluation model is described. Subsequently, the sub-policy focuses only on the evaluation form called 'Student Surveys' in the evaluation model and student evaluations in the policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. BACKGROUND	2
2. OBJECTIVE	3
3. STUDENT EVALUATIONS IN THE QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM	4
4. TASKS AND EXPECTATIONS	6
4.1. Teaching evaluations	6
4.1.1. Course evaluations	6
4.1.2. Project evaluations	7
4.2. Programme evaluations	7
4.2.1. Study start	7
4.2.2. Programme satisfaction.....	7
4.2.3. Exit survey	8
5. RESULTS AND FOLLOW UP	9
5.1. Teaching evaluations	9
5.1.1. Course evaluations	9
5.1.2. Project evaluations	10
5.2. Programme evaluations	10
5.2.1. Study start	10
5.2.2. Programme satisfaction.....	10
5.2.3. Graduate survey	10
5.2.4. Exit survey	10
6. RESPONSIBILITY	11
6.1. Course and project evaluations that specify teachers or supervisors by name.....	11

1. BACKGROUND


CBS' Teaching Evaluation Model¹ comprises four evaluation forms: Student Surveys, Midterm, Quality Boards and Peer Consultations. The four forms of evaluation each contribute to the development and quality assurance of teaching at CBS. Together, these four forms of evaluations comprise the CBS Teaching Evaluation Model.

CBS' work with **Student Surveys** or student evaluations is described from section 2 onwards. The three other evaluation types are also described briefly.

Midterms, CBS expects a midterm evaluation to be conducted for all teaching activities. Freedom of method applies to midterm evaluations. Teachers are expected to evaluate with the students approximately midway through the teaching activity and this can be e.g. orally during a teaching session or a survey. The main point is to gather knowledge so that adjustments can be made to the teaching if necessary.

Quality Boards, which are managed by the individual programmes, are forums where students can give their input to the teaching on individual courses. Quality Boards are described in a separate sub-policy for Quality Boards. Quality Boards are only applicable for BSc and MSc programmes.

Peer Consultations are recurring sparring consultations with colleagues among faculty. They are carried out at least once every five years.




¹ CBS' Teaching Evaluation Model was defined during the strategy project "Teaching Appreciation & Quality" in 2022.

2. OBJECTIVE

This sub-policy describes the student evaluations conducted at CBS and how the results are used as both management information and for quality development. The sub-policy also describes the processes linked to student evaluations, as well as the opportunities and expectations related to the use of evaluation results. This includes how the evaluation results are published, and what feedback is given to students.

The figure below illustrates the evaluation landscape which contains all student evaluations carried out at CBS.

Figure 1: CBS Evaluation landscape



The structure of the individual sections below follows the landscape above. As a general rule, the evaluations are described in relation to the two overall categories: programme evaluations and teaching evaluations. The teaching evaluations include course and project evaluations, which are conducted at course level, and therefore facilitate follow-up that is very close to the teaching activity itself. Programme evaluations include surveys at programme level within various areas: study start, general student satisfaction (CBS Academic Year Evaluation as well as the Danish National Student Survey), graduate surveys and exit surveys.

3. STUDENT EVALUATIONS IN THE QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

Student evaluations are one of several tools for developing and improving both teaching and programmes. The evaluation results represent the students' subjective experiences and satisfaction. With this in mind, the student evaluations are included in and supply input for a range of processes in the quality assurance system at CBS and, as key data, form the backbone of the system. Student evaluations contribute to the relevant stakeholders being able to develop and amend the courses and programmes.

An active and dynamic evaluation culture is relevant and in focus – not least in CBS' quality work and quality assurance. Thus, it is central how student evaluations are perceived, used and discussed at CBS.

The products at CBS where input from student evaluations is used:

- The study boards' continuous quality work and development of programme courses
- The course coordinators' and teachers' continuous quality work and development of the programme courses and the teaching
- Strategic projects across CBS
- Programme reports and head of studies reports/associate dean reports²
- Recurrent programme peer reviews
- Teaching environment evaluations
- The study boards' dialogue with Quality Boards
- The teaching portfolio, which is revised by academic staff in connection with their Performance and development review (MUS)

Students' commitment to participating in the development of courses and programmes is central for quality assurance work where student feedback and satisfaction are included in quality development. It is CBS' policy to actively engage and motivate students to participate in the student evaluations and thereby give their input for the quality assurance work. This is done e.g. through a focus on the evaluation culture, including response rates, and is broadly anchored in and driven by both academic staff and the CBS' administration.

The study boards are responsible for processing and using the student evaluations conducted for their programme(s). This applies to both the teaching and programme evaluations and covers course and project evaluations, student satisfaction, study start, graduate and exit surveys.

Study boards document their processing of student evaluations in the material from study board meetings. How the results are specifically processed and included in quality development is decided by the individual study boards.

However, it is central that the results are used consciously and systematically on an equal footing with other input, and with inclusion of the knowledge possessed by the study board and the individual stakeholders in relation to the programme. The main focus is reflecting on what the evaluation results mean and how the knowledge can be used in relation to the specific courses and programmes. The evaluation results are used best in the context where they are collected and can rarely stand alone.

² 'Studielederberetning' is translated into 'head of studies report' for BSc and MSc programmes and into 'associate dean report' for HD and Master programmes corresponding to the translation of the title 'studieleder' for the two different educational areas.

In addition, a study director and head of studies/associate dean must address course evaluation results in the annual programme report and head of studies report / associate dean report respectively. The quality standard for course evaluations at bachelor and master programmes is set at minimum 66 pct. In other words, the share of students who answers 4 or 5 on a scale from 1 to 5, must be at least 66 pct.³ The key figure is based on the question on overall satisfaction with the course. Heads of studies/associate deans are responsible for following up on whether the total key figures for course evaluations are below 66 pct. Heads of studies in collaboration with study directors for BSc and MSc programmes. If a key figure is below 66 pct this must be investigated in more detail and an action plan must be included in the programme report. The key figure cannot stand alone and must be used with other data from the evaluation results; see further description in section 5.1.

For HD and Master programmes (also called executive education programmes) the quality standard is set at minimum 85 pct. Associate dean has the same responsibility for follow-up as at BSc and MSc programmes.

A high user satisfaction is an important sales and competition parameter for executive education programmes. The programmes need to market themselves with a particularly high level of student satisfaction to remain attractive in a highly competitive market within continuing professional development.

³ Calculated based on the question "My overall impression of the course was positive" and includes all students who gave scores of 4 and 5 ("agree" and "strongly agree") on a scale from 1–5.

4. TASKS AND EXPECTATIONS

In this section stakeholder responsibilities and what is expected of those who are responsible for educational quality is described. Responsibilities and expectations are described for the individual evaluation types based on three stages of an evaluation: what happens before an evaluation is initiated, while the students are evaluating, and when an evaluation is completed.

Response rates and the number of student responses constitute a core element that requires a persistent focus. For some evaluation types, response rates at CBS have been decreasing, while others have been increasing. As there is a general wish to increase survey participation and response rates at CBS, this is also a focus point in the sub-policy.

Heads of studies/associate deans, study directors (for BSc and Msc programmes), course coordinators and teachers have a shared responsibility for boosting response rates, as described in detail under the individual evaluation types.

For an overview of the tasks distributed among the various stakeholders, see appendix A.

4.1. TEACHING EVALUATIONS

As a general rule at CBS, all ECTS credit-bearing course activities are evaluated as either course evaluations or project evaluations.

4.1.1. Course evaluations

Course evaluations are the most common type of evaluation conducted at CBS and this type is highest in volume. This type of evaluation focuses on the teaching rather than exams. Consequently, students complete evaluations before their exams, and exams are not evaluated on the basis of surveys. The results are generally released after grading has been completed. This ensures that evaluation results do not influence how exams are graded.

Experience and analysis show that response rates are higher when teachers allocate time in class for students to evaluate. Course coordinators/teachers are expected to motivate students by e.g. specifying how the evaluation is included in the work of developing and making adjustments to the course. This can be part of the feedback CBS gives to students concerning student evaluations.

Individual study boards are expected to communicate any specific changes to course/programme regulations that are prompted by the evaluations. The study board can organise how this is communicated most appropriately for the specific programme. However, once a year in May the study board must also notify the students on MyCBS of any changes to the course and programme regulations based on the suggestions received in evaluations, from Quality Boards etc.

Before students complete an evaluation:

- The course coordinator and teacher, immediately before the survey opens, check whether the right teachers are being evaluated on the course in question.
- The course coordinator and/or teacher plan when time can be allocated in class for the students to evaluate.
- CBS' administration (BIA) supports these expectations in relation to the course coordinator and teacher by sending mails, providing access to support tools as well as materials that can be used when evaluation in class.

While students are evaluating:

- The course coordinator and/or teacher allocate time in class for the student evaluations and motivate the students to participate. Both the course coordinator and teacher can follow the response rate while a course evaluation is open for students.

When students have finished evaluating:

- The results are processed by the study board in compliance with the process defined by the study board.
- The course coordinator follows up with the team of teachers with a focus on both results incl. comments from the students that might be difficult or uncomfortable for a teacher to receive.

4.1.2. Project evaluations

Project evaluations are conducted for projects that focuses on supervision and not on the teaching itself. Unlike with course evaluations, CBS works with several types of project evaluations.

Basically, there are two types of project evaluations; evaluations of the final projects and evaluations of the projects completed during the programme.

Both types of evaluations can be carried out with questions on supervision and the supervisor. In other words, the supervision in general is evaluated. The students also receive some project evaluation questions that enable them to evaluate their specific supervisor. The latter questions facilitate collection of knowledge related to individual supervisors.

Both the departments and programmes would generally like to evaluate individual supervisors in detail by name, but that places high demands in terms of data quality when linking supervisors to students. In practice, only few projects include the potential for students to evaluate individual supervisors and therefore in most cases, the supervision alone is evaluated.

Before students evaluate:

- The course coordinator and/or supervisor plan how, in a meaningful way, they can motivate the students to complete evaluations.

While students are evaluating:

- The course coordinator and/or supervisor motivate the students to evaluate.

When students have finished evaluating:

- The results are processed by the study board in accordance with the process defined by the study board.
- The course coordinator follows up with the supervisor– also in relation to any comments from the students that can be difficult to receive.

CBS has established a thesis collective, which, among other things, is tasked with following up on the annual evaluation of master's theses and submits a report to the dean of education.

4.2. PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS

Programme evaluations evaluate the activities at programme level. This can be at the end of the study period or as a 'health check' during the programme.

4.2.1. Study start

Study start evaluations at CBS are conducted for all bachelor's and master's students in connection with their study start. As a general rule, study starts in the area of continuing education are not evaluated.

Study start evaluations focus on how students experience their study starts, their initial sense of belonging to the programme and the guidance and information they have received from CBS.

4.2.2. Programme satisfaction

Programme satisfaction relates to the students' experience with their study programme in general. Bachelor's and master's programmes are evaluated both via CBS' Academic Year Evaluation, which is conducted at the end of the

academic year, as well as the Danish National Student Survey, which is conducted every second year. The former is conducted by CBS, whereas the Ministry of Higher Education and Science is responsible for the latter. Currently, CBS is not conducting general satisfaction evaluations at Management Programmes.

CBS Academic Year Evaluation

Academic Year Evaluations measure students' experience with their programmes, learning, study environments, administration, and general well-being.

Danish Student Survey

Danish National Student Surveys measure not only programme satisfaction but also other themes, including the teaching, teachers and study environment, including the physical environment at the study programmes.

Danish graduate survey

Graduate surveys are conducted after students complete their study programmes. The CBS graduate survey for master's students who have completed their programmes at CBS is conducted by the Ministry of Higher Education and Science in connection with the Danish National Student Survey for graduates. Master's graduates who have completed their degree at least one year up to maximum of three years prior to the sending out the survey are the target group.

Knowledge is collected on a broad range of themes including e.g. study environment, competencies and experience while transitioning to the labour market.

4.2.3. Exit survey

Exit surveys are conducted immediately after students complete their study programmes. At CBS, this type of survey is conducted exclusively within the area of executive education (HD and Master programmes). A range of knowledge is collected on the individual study programmes, but on a number of identical themes, such as whether graduates would recommend the education, learning environment and usefulness of the education in the business community.

For the executive education programmes a quality standard for exit surveys has been set because the results give valuable input to the quality assurance and quality development of HD and Master programmes at CBS. A high user satisfaction registered through the exit surveys is also an important sales and competition parameter. The HD and Master programmes need to market themselves with a particular high level of student satisfaction to remain attractive in a highly competitive market within continuing professional development.

From 2026 onward a quantitative quality standard is set to minimum **85 %** of the number of students that must answer "Agree" or "Strongly agree" to questions on:

- Recommendation of the programme
- Applicability of the programme

5. RESULTS AND FOLLOW UP

Results from the various types of student evaluations are used for management information, quality assurance and for developing the individual programmes.

Survey results are used for various purposes, and it is key that their content and type are considered before use.

Study boards/programme managements/study director (for BSc and MSc programmes) use the results from all the evaluation types and are responsible for follow-up on the individual evaluations in accordance with the standards described in sections 3 and 4 of this policy. The results can also be discussed by the Quality Boards of the individual programmes (only applicable for BSc and MSc programmes). Each department management team is responsible for following up on course evaluations concerning teachers employed at their department. The course coordinator must, together with the teachers, follow up on course evaluations regarding courses for which they are responsible.

The following section is a description of the most commonly used rating scale and comment fields at CBS. It is a technical description of the rating scale and the general key figures typically used for reporting.

For rating questions, the most popular scale is a 5-point Likert scale ranging from completely disagree to completely agree. This means that an average can be calculated as well as the percentage of students who agree with a particular statement. For a rating question ranging on a scale from 1–5, an average of below 3 would express an average dissatisfaction with the entity being rated, e.g. an exercise class. The average is shown in the reporting and when the individual results are processed, the specific question formulation as well as the distribution of responses in the five categories should be included.

The percentage of students who agree with a statement, i.e. those who answer 4 and 5 on a scale from 1-5, can be perceived as satisfied students. The quality standard, 66 pct / 85 pct is described in section 3 of this policy. .

In the following sections it is described how the results are made accessible, and how and who follows up on the evaluation results.

5.1. TEACHING EVALUATIONS

This section includes how to manage follow-up-tasks in relation to teaching evaluations, divided into course and project evaluations. The focus is partly on what knowledge is collected, and partly on what/how this knowledge can be applied.

5.1.1. Course evaluations

With course evaluations, knowledge is collected on both the teaching and the teachers involved.

The course evaluations collect answers to so-called rating questions and more qualitative input in the form of comments from the students.

Comments made in the course evaluations can be sensitive and can contain both constructive and less constructive feedback from students. This sensitivity must therefore be considered when results are used. Similarly, the individual stakeholders must be aware that the qualitative comments from students can be used to better elaborate and understand the results from the rating questions. They can be useful in indicating where development/work is required for quality assurance purposes. The comments must not stand alone and should be compared to other types of knowledge or explanations.

5.1.2. Project evaluations

Project evaluations can be conducted both with and without linking students to their supervisors (described in section 3). As this is of importance for both reporting and following up, this section is divided into two sections.

Project evaluations linked to supervisors by name

The same guidelines on comments from students apply to these evaluations as those specified for the course evaluations. With project evaluations, often individual supervisors do not supervise large groups of students. Comments therefore constitute key knowledge for individual supervisors, as rating questions are of limited use when very few responses are received. Individual students' satisfaction with the project process can be interpreted. However, conclusions cannot be reached based on a very few responses in the individual categories of a rating question.

Project evaluations without supervisor names

These evaluations sometimes generate few responses. This may be due to the difficulty of conducting the evaluation in class if no or limited teaching is involved. Therefore, in some cases, reports are not released, since reports are only released if a minimum of five students have completed an evaluation.

Project evaluations can be used to assess supervision in connection with a project process and the students' experience of various elements of this process (introduction, teaching, if any, as well as the writing process).

5.2. PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS

With programme evaluations at CBS, results are released to the programmes and groups across CBS, which use the results for quality assurance.

5.2.1. Study start

The results are made available to the programmes and student administration. The student administration uses the results to improve and develop study starts across the programmes. Here, there is also focus on following-up on the comments written by students.

5.2.2. Programme satisfaction

The two types of programme satisfaction surveys (the CBS Academic Year Evaluation as well as the Danish National Student Surveys) are both used by the study boards on bachelor's and master's programmes. Access is given to various reports, and the individual study boards are responsible for assessing how the results can be included in quality assurance for the individual programmes.

5.2.3. Graduate survey

The results are used by the study boards in their quality assurance work for the individual bachelor's or master's programmes. It is expected that the results are followed up on and that it is assessed how the results can be used for quality assurance.

5.2.4. Exit survey

Exit surveys are conducted at executive education and, as it is for the other types of programme evaluations, study boards are expected to follow up on the results and use them for quality assurance to the extent that it is relevant. The results are also used to a varying degree for marketing purposes for individual programmes.

6. RESPONSIBILITY

Overall responsibility for student evaluations at CBS is anchored with the Dean of Education.

The Act on Universities clearly specifies that each study board is responsible for:

“Assuring and developing the quality of the programme and teaching and ensuring follow-up on the programme and teaching evaluations.”

At CBS, heads of department are responsible for the academic development of faculty, and therefore they have access to all reports where the faculty members of the department have taught or supervised. Heads of department are also responsible for using these results to encourage academic development among faculty and when organising the teaching and supervision process.

As described in section 4, the evaluation results should be used intentionally and with reflection, based on the knowledge individuals already possess in their field and knowledge from other sources. This can be from Quality Boards, midterm evaluations and Peer Consultations.

With teaching evaluations that involve students evaluating their teachers or supervisors by name, however, a number of special considerations apply, as specified below.

6.1. COURSE AND PROJECT EVALUATIONS THAT SPECIFY TEACHERS OR SUPERVISORS BY NAME

For course evaluations and project evaluations covering both the teaching and individual teachers or supervisors, special considerations apply.

Both the study board and department management in question have special responsibility for the results, which must be processed with sensitivity regarding data and knowledge from comments in particular. This requires a special focus and the following expectations:

- **The course coordinator** follows up with their teacher(s) bearing in mind that teachers may be affected by students' comments
- **The head of studies/associate dean** is responsible for following up on the evaluation results with the course coordinator and for making sure that the overall results are being discussed by the study board with the purpose of developing the teaching. The programme director is also responsible for ensuring that the study board follows up, involving the relevant course coordinators, if student comments regarding certain teachers or courses are deemed to require further investigation and a decision on potential follow-up.
For BSc and MSc programmes, the **study director** is involved in this work. The **study director** can also initiate/suggest specific actions based on evaluation results.
- **The head of department** follows up with teachers and is available to help and offer support the teacher and course coordinator when necessary.
- **The course coordinator and/or teacher** may always contact CBS Legal if student comments are deemed offensive. Students are also informed of this before participation in an evaluation.
- **The course coordinator and/or teacher** may contact CBS Educational Development & Quality for sparring or guidance on developing their teaching e.g. based on the knowledge gained from student evaluations.

It is particularly important that results from student evaluations are encompassed by a culture where both positive and negative results can be discussed, and that these results are considered a starting point for development – and not an aspect individuals should attempt to conceal. A culture where comments can be discussed and reflected on, and where student input is used for development and improvement. And the results should never stand alone as a means of defining good or bad educational quality or good and bad teachers.

In connection with student evaluations and surveys in general, different types of bias will always be present. CBS focuses on bias in the work with student evaluations, including the use of evaluation results. As part of the positive and constructive evaluation culture that CBS strives to encourage, is where everyone is responsible for challenging and working on bias that comes to our attention.

Educational Development & Quality

Copenhagen Business School
Søbjerg Plads 3
2000 Frederiksberg
Denmark

cbs.dk

Log:

Adopted 26 October 2023

Applicable from the spring semester 2024

Revised June 2024, January 2025 and January 2026

Amendments approved July 2024, January 2025 and January 2026

Applicable with changes from spring semester 2026