



## **Minutes**

of the meeting of the Student Feedback Sub-Committee held at Kenézy Villa  
on April 16, 2026 at 2.00 pm

**Present:** Prof. Dr Zoltán Papp, Vice Dean for Scientific Affairs, Chair of the Feedback Subcommittee; Dr Balázs Erdődi; Róza Zákány; Dr Pál Pap, Head of Registrar's Office, Faculty of Medicine, University of Debrecen; Csongor Fejes; Bence Ördög; Bernadett Balog, Áron Máté Guba and Zsófi Szabó, student member of the Faculty of Medicine.

**Dr Zoltán Papp**, Vice Dean, welcomed those present and announced that the meeting would proceed according to the agenda issued.

**Dr Pál Pap**, Head of the Registrar's Office, explained that he would begin his presentation with agenda item II.

### **II. Agenda: Presentation and discussion of the feedback results for the first semester of the academic year 2025/26.**

**Dr Pál Pap**, Head of Registrar's Office, presented the feedback results for the first semester of the academic year 2025/26. (See Appendix I). He stated that he would begin the evaluation with the results relating to Medical Program, and then move on to the divided programs. He explained that the basic rule is that a 30% completion rate must be achieved for every subject in order for the results to be evaluable. Under this system, students must rate the subject on a scale of 1 to 5. In previous years, the completion rate was very low across all years, and they attempted to improve this by allowing students who complete at least five questionnaires during the semester to register for exams in the Neptun system one day earlier. This did improve the completion rates.

In the first semester of the academic year 2024/2025, a new bonus system was also introduced for the sixth year; the results of this will also be reported at this meeting.

Regarding medical training, feedback from Hungarian students shows that all subjects achieve an average rating of around 4. The Anatomy, Histology and Embryology III Lecture received a rating of 3.74, the Biochemistry I Lecture 3.91, and Medical Sociology 3.82. Clinical Genetics received a rating of 3.76, Orthopedics 3.98, and Internal Medicine V (Gastroenterology and Metabolic Diseases) 3.86.



***Dr Pál Pap***, Head of the Registrar's Office, presented the feedback results from students on the English Medicine Program. The figures show that students on the English Program gave lower scores for the subjects. Anatomy, Histology and Embryology I. Lecture received a score of 3.83, Biophysics Lecture 3.81, Biostatistics 3.94, Basics of Behavioural Sciences 3.78, and Anatomy, Histology and Embryology III. Lecture received a score of 3.92, Biochemistry I. Lecture 3.79, and Medical Physiology I. Lecture 3.95. The Stomatology course received a very low score of **3.53**.

The students said that the problem with the Stomatology course might be that students cannot miss any sessions at all, and the lecturer does not care about the students. In their view, they are required to learn things they do not need. The syllabus is not distinct from the material taught to dentists. The students do not see the point of the course.

The Obstetrics and Gynecology Block Practice received a score of 3.89, in response to which Dr Balázs Erdódi asked the students to say a few words about what might be the problem with the practical session.

In response, the students explained that there is no interaction between the tutor and the student; often, the tutor does not explain what is happening during the operation. Regarding the VI. year practice, they said that the on-call system does not work entirely well. Sometimes nothing happens during on-call hours, and in such cases, the time spent at the clinic takes away from study time. Furthermore, it happens that a student is scheduled in the operating room for the entire duration of the practice, meaning they cannot undertake gynecology practice, only obstetrics. It would often be more helpful if they could attend specialist clinics rather than assisting in the operating room.

In response, ***Dr Balázs Erdódi*** explained that, as the academic coordinator, he places great emphasis on ensuring that students do not spend their entire practice in the operating room but are also able to rotate through specialist clinics; however, this always depends on the size of the practice group. When there are few VI. year students on practice, it may be necessary for them to assist in the operating room, particularly if they are competent students. Consequently, it may happen that a student is assigned to the operating room for the entire duration of their practice.

***Dr Pál Pap***, Head of Registrar's Office, presented the feedback results for the block practices. Every subject received a rating of 4 or higher this term. In terms of the number of students per tutor, Neurology continues to have the highest student numbers. This can be explained by the low number of teaching staff. Furthermore, Pediatrics, Obstetrics and Gynecology, and Neurology received lower ratings based on the responses to some of the questions in the



questionnaire. The summary table shows that, overall, student ratings for the block practices have improved.

**Dr Pál Pap**, Head of Department, presented the feedback results for the divided programs. (See Appendix I) He first presented the results for the BSc program in Medical Diagnostic Analysis. He explained that there are four specializations within the program. In the first semester, all students study the same curriculum, but from the second semester onwards, they also have specialization-specific modules. Among the results received, many more subjects received lower ratings than in previous semesters. Physics scored **3.56**, Mathematics and Statistics **3.59**, Bioethics 3.90, General Pathology 3.78, Fundamentals of Oncology 3.94, Macropathology II **3.59**, Microbiological Diagnostic Methods 3.88, Flow Cytometry 3.00, Microscopic Techniques **2.67**, and Cell Biology **3.11**.

The Head of Registrar's Office continued the presentation with the results of the MSc programs. In the case of the Health Psychology MSc Program, only the subject Public Health received a rating below 4. (**3.45**)

In the MSc program in Molecular Biology, Biophysics received a score of **3.07**, Genomics and Systems Biology 3.67, Human Physiology I **2.70**, Molecular Genetics 3.96, and Molecular Immunology **3.49**. For students on the English Program of the same degree, Biophysics received a score of **3.04**, Human Physiology I **3.14**, and Molecular Immunology 3.66.

Given that no student representative from the divided program attended the meeting, the students were unable to provide an explanation for the low scores received for these subjects.

**I. Agenda: Evaluation of sixth-year student feedback for the 2024/2025 academic year**

**Dr Pál Pap**, Head of Department, explained that a new bonus system had been introduced for the sixth year in the first semester of the academic year 2024/2025, and he would now like to report on the results of this. In previous years, there were numerous instances where there was an insufficient amount of student feedback regarding the sixth year, as students did not complete the questionnaires. Therefore, a bonus system was introduced whereby, if a sixth-year student completes the questionnaires for all subjects, they will be able to select their oral examination date one day earlier than the standard application deadline. This enabled them to achieve a very high completion rate in the academic year 2024/2025. The final year can only be assessed for the entire academic year, not by semester. Consequently, the Committee can only discuss this



assessment at every second meeting. It can be said that all final-year subjects received very good assessments; here, even the student-to-tutor ratio shows a truly positive result.

**Dr Zoltán Papp**, Vice Dean, thanked the Head of the Registrar's Office for presenting the results and asked whether the students had anything to say regarding the Anatomy course.

In response, the students said that a meeting had already taken place between the Head of the Anatomy Department and the student representatives regarding the course requirements and examination rules. In their view, students should not have to retake those sections they had already passed in a previous exam. The same applies to the histology test: if a student has already passed it, why should they have to go through this part of the exam again?

**Dr Róza Zákány**, speaking on behalf of the Institute of Anatomy, Histology and Embryology, replied that these make-up exams serve to weed out students who do not even know the basic concepts. This ensures that students who do not even understand the basics do not proceed to the oral exam. They do not take up the time of the other examinees during the oral exam.

**Dr Zoltán Papp**, Vice Dean, added that the number of students awaiting the final exam in Anatomy, Histology and Embryology is steadily increasing. It is the failure rate that is causing such a high number of students. It is important to find a solution to prevent such a high number of students failing this subject. Students have not become less capable, so it is clear that something needs to be changed in the teaching of the subject or the examination system to increase the pass rate.

**Dr Róza Zákány** explained that the curriculum change also involved modifications to the examination system. There is no partial fulfillment. At the time of partial completion, students only learnt specific sections of the course material for individual exams; they did not cover the entire syllabus. The examination requirements for previously completed sections could be refined, but she does not support the abolition of re-examinations for sections already passed in previous exams. The head of the department may decide on this. She herself would support mid-year exemptions and test-taking.

The students explained that there had been several discussions with the head of the institute on this matter, but they had not yet managed to reach an agreement.

Before the end of the meeting, student representative **Zsófi Szabó** wished to propose that the VI. Year extra practice, which must be taken if you fail the exam, should be abolished. Other medical schools no longer have such extra practical sessions – required following a failed exam



– and students do not find them useful either. In many cases, completing the extra practical weeks causes final-year students to miss the deadline for registering for the state exam.

**Dr Zoltán Papp**, Vice Dean, thanked everyone for their work over the years. In the future, this Committee will have a different membership, given that new leadership will be elected at the Faculty. He wished everyone continued success in their work.

Dr Zoltán Papp

University Lecturer

Chair of the Student Feedback Sub-

Committee

Judit Sarkadiné Domján

minute-taker

Debrecen, 16 April 2026