

**TITU MAIORESCU UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST**  
**FACULTY \_\_\_\_\_, PROGRAMME \_\_\_\_\_**  
**YEAR OF STUDY \_\_\_\_**

**TEACHER ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE BY STUDENTS**

Assessed teacher: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Discipline of study \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Participation**

To what extent have you participated in didactic activities at this discipline (mark with an **X** the cell corresponding to your participation.):

		Always	More than half	Half	Less than half	Never
<b>P1</b>	Course (C)					
<b>P2</b>	Seminar (S) <sup>1</sup>					
<b>P3</b>	Laboratory (L) <sup>2</sup>					

**P.4** What are your reasons for not participating at some forms of didactic activity at this discipline (if it is the case)?

\_\_\_\_\_

If you have attended less than half of the activities or none of them, fill only **E10**.

**II. Assessment**

Evaluation results will be statistically processed and will not be made public. The questionnaire is anonymous.

Mark an **X** for a **single variant** which best corresponds with your opinion on **each** of the statements below, according to the following scale: **5** – Strongly Agree, **4** – Agree, **3** – Neither Agree nor Disagree, **2** – Disagree, **1** – Strongly Disagree.

		5	4	3	2	1
<b>E1</b>	I understand the usefulness of the information presented at <b>C/S/L</b> for my future profession.					
<b>E2</b>	The teacher presented clearly from the early hours of activity, the criteria and evaluation methods of students work for <b>C/S/L</b> .					
<b>E3</b>	The teacher has managed to capture the attention of students in the <b>C/S/L</b> .					
<b>E4</b>	During the <b>C/S/L</b> there was dialogue between students and the teacher to clarify the information presented.					
<b>E5</b>	The teacher was available to provide consultancy to students.					
<b>E6</b>	Transmission of information by the teacher in the <b>C/S/L</b> was done on my meaning.					
<b>E7</b>	The teacher had an academic attire in the <b>C/S/L</b> .					
<b>E8</b>	The teacher respects students.					
<b>E9</b>	At this <b>C/S/L</b> were conducted all hours scheduled.					
<b>E10</b>	The evaluations of the students during the semester/final evaluation were objective and fair, in accordance with the criteria set out initially.					

Other opinions about the assessed teacher:

\_\_\_\_\_

Appreciate the overall activity of the teacher assessed with a score of 1 to 10: \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you!**

<sup>1</sup> If the discipline is provided with seminar.  
<sup>2</sup> If the discipline is provided with laboratory.

**TITU MAIORESCU UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST**  
**FACULTY** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DEPARTMENT** \_\_\_\_\_

**SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE THEACHER**

Name and Surname: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark an **X** for each evaluation criterion in a single cell in the column corresponding to the given rating, according to the following scale: **5** – Very Good, **4** – Good, **3** – Acceptable, **2** – Poor, **1** – Very Poor.

Crt. No.	EVALUATION CRITERION	RATING				
		5	4	3	2	1
C1	Conducting full and of quality of didactic activities provided in the list of positions and in the schedule					
C2	Quality of evaluations during the semester/final evaluation of students (objectivity, correctness, compliance with the criteria of evaluation initially presented).					
C3	Concern for the development of teaching materials.					
C4	Involvement in research activities of the department/faculty/university					
C5	Involvement in grants/projects/contracts, others than for scientific research.					
C6	Willingness to undertake/to receive administrative and organizational tasks in the department/faculty/university and the fulfillment of the tasks undertaken/received.					
C7	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with peers from department/faculty/university.					
C8	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with students.					
C9	Academic attire in the academic community and beyond.					
C10	Concern for promoting the image of the department/faculty/university.					
<b>Number of ratings at the same level</b>		<b><i>n</i><sub>5</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>4</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>3</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>2</sub></b>	<b><i>n</i><sub>1</sub></b>
<b>Score achieved (P)<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>SYNTHETIC RATING<sup>2</sup></b>						

<sup>1</sup> Formula for calculating the score

$$P = \frac{5 \cdot n_5 + 4 \cdot n_4 + 3 \cdot n_3 + 2 \cdot n_2 + n_1}{n_5 + n_4 + n_3 + n_2 + n_1}$$

<sup>2</sup> The synthetic rating is given by the following equivalence score achieved:

Between 5.0 and 4.0 points:	<b>VERY GOOD</b>
Between 3.99 and 2.5 points:	<b>GOOD</b>
Between 2.49 and 1,25 points:	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>
Less than 1.25 points:	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>

Other opinions about my work in the department/faculty/university:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

**TITU MAIORESCU UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST**  
**FACULTY** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DEPARTMENT** \_\_\_\_\_

**ASSESSMENT OF THE THEACHER BY THE DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR**

Name and Surname of the assessed teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark an **X** for each evaluation criterion in a single cell in the column corresponding to the given rating, according to the following scale: **5** – Very Good, **4** – Good, **3** – Acceptable, **2** – Poor, **1** – Very Poor.

Crt. No.	EVALUATION CRITERION	RATING				
		5	4	3	2	1
C1	Conducting full and of quality of didactic activities provided in the list of positions and in the schedule					
C2	Quality of evaluations during the semester/final evaluation of students (objectivity, correctness, compliance with the criteria of evaluation initially presented).					
C3	Concern for the development of teaching materials.					
C4	Involvement in research activities of the department/faculty/university					
C5	Involvement in grants/projects/contracts, others than for scientific research.					
C6	Willingness to undertake/to receive administrative and organizational tasks in the department/faculty/university and the fulfillment of the tasks undertaken/received.					
C7	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with peers from department/faculty/university.					
C8	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with students.					
C9	Academic attire in the academic community and beyond.					
C10	Concern for promoting the image of the department/faculty/university.					
<b>Number of ratings at the same level</b>		<i>n<sub>5</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>3</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>1</sub></i>
<b>Score achieved (P)<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>SYNTHETIC RATING<sup>2</sup></b>						

<sup>1</sup> Formula for calculating the score

$$P = \frac{5 \cdot n_5 + 4 \cdot n_4 + 3 \cdot n_3 + 2 \cdot n_2 + n_1}{n_5 + n_4 + n_3 + n_2 + n_1}$$

<sup>2</sup> The synthetic rating is given by the following equivalence score achieved:

Between 5.0 and 4.0 points:	<b>VERY GOOD</b>
Between 3.99 and 2.5 points:	<b>GOOD</b>
Between 2.49 and 1,25 points:	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>
Less than 1.25 points:	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>

Other opinions about the assessed teacher:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR,**

**TITU MAIORESCU UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST**  
**FACULTY** \_\_\_\_\_  
**DEPARTMENT** \_\_\_\_\_

**PEER ASSESSMENT**

Name and Surname of the assessed teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Surname of the assessor: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark an **X** for each evaluation criterion in a single cell in the column corresponding to the given rating, according to the following scale: **5** – Very Good, **4** – Good, **3** – Acceptable, **2** – Poor, **1** – Very Poor.

Crt. No.	EVALUATION CRITERION	RATING				
		5	4	3	2	1
C1	Conducting full and of quality of didactic activities provided in the list of positions and in the schedule					
C2	Quality of evaluations during the semester/final evaluation of students (objectivity, correctness, compliance with the criteria of evaluation initially presented).					
C3	Concern for the development of teaching materials.					
C4	Involvement in research activities of the department/faculty/university					
C5	Involvement in grants/projects/contracts, others than for scientific research.					
C6	Willingness to undertake/to receive administrative and organizational tasks in the department/faculty/university and the fulfillment of the tasks undertaken/received.					
C7	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with peers from department/faculty/university.					
C8	Quality of academic interpersonal relationships with students.					
C9	Academic attire in the academic community and beyond.					
C10	Concern for promoting the image of the department/faculty/university.					
<b>Number of ratings at the same level</b>		<i>n<sub>5</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>4</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>3</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>n<sub>1</sub></i>
<b>Score achieved (P)<sup>1</sup></b>						
<b>SYNTHETIC RATING<sup>2</sup></b>						

<sup>1</sup> Formula for calculating the score

$$P = \frac{5 \cdot n_5 + 4 \cdot n_4 + 3 \cdot n_3 + 2 \cdot n_2 + n_1}{n_5 + n_4 + n_3 + n_2 + n_1}$$

<sup>2</sup> The synthetic rating is given by the following equivalence score achieved:

Between 5.0 and 4.0 points:	<b>VERY GOOD</b>
Between 3.99 and 2.5 points:	<b>GOOD</b>
Between 2.49 and 1,25 points:	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>
Less than 1.25 points:	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>

Other opinions about the assessed teacher:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature