

# Hungarian Accreditation Committee (MAB)

Site-Visit Team follow-up report  
based on WFME 2020 standards on the

## **medical education of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Pécs**

Appendix of Decision No 2025/8/XII of the MAB BOARD



## Table of contents

I. Background .....	3
II. Accreditation proposal .....	3
III. Site-Visit Team .....	4
IV. Evaluation .....	4
IV.1 Educational programme .....	4
IV.2 Evaluation process of the educational programme.....	5
IV.3 Quality assurance.....	6
V. Summarized evaluation regarding the standards involved in the monitoring process .....	9

## I. Background

The General Medicine programme at the University of Pécs was accredited by the MAB Board under WFME standards, as set out in Resolution No. 2021/10/V. The accreditation is valid for a period of eight years, until 3 March 2030, subject to continuous compliance with the standards and a mid-cycle monitoring procedure, including an on-site visit to be conducted by 31 December 2025. For the purpose of the monitoring procedure, the institution submitted its monitoring report along with the relevant annexes.

The panel interviews were conducted by the Site-Visit Team on 12 November 2025.

During the monitoring procedure, the Site-Visit Team appointed by MAB primarily assessed the institutional actions taken in response to the recommendations outlined in the report and the effectiveness of those actions.

The WFME standards assessed for partial compliance were the following:

- Standard 2.2 Development and review of the educational programme;
- Standard 2.3 Educational, teaching and pedagogical methods used to deliver the educational programme;
- Standard 3.1 System of assessment;
- Standard 7 Quality assurance.

## II. Accreditation proposal

Based on the self-evaluation monitoring report of the medical school and the site visit, it can be concluded that general medical education at the University of Pécs Medical School (hereinafter: UPMS), with regard to the WFME 2020 (World Federation for Medical Education) standards, is found to be

- **compliant** with the criteria of Standard 2.2 (Development and review of the educational programme),
- **compliant** with the criteria of Standard 2.3 (Educational, teaching and pedagogical methods used to deliver the educational programme),
- **compliant** with the criteria of Standard 3.1 (System of assessment),
- **partially compliant** with the criteria of Standard 7 (Quality assurance).

It was established that the institution has responded to all recommendations set out in the previous report and implemented substantive measures. As a result, positive changes have been observed in relation to each recommendation, while partial compliance remains in the area of quality assurance.

The Site-Visit Team recommends that the MAB Board confirm the accreditation until **3 March 2030**, with the institution submitting a written report to MAB by **30 September 2027** as part of the monitoring procedure. In this report, the institution should present the measures taken to address the quality improvement proposals related to Standard 7, which was assessed as partially compliant.

The monitoring process shall primarily examine the institutional measures taken on the basis of the recommendations of this report and their effectiveness.

### III. Site-Visit Team

**Chair:** Prof. László Mátyus, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, University of Debrecen

**Members:** Prof. Gyöngyvér Harvainé Szabó, quality assurance expert

Prof. Miklós Kellermayer, Chairman, Department of Biophysics and Radiation Biology, Semmelweis University

Prof. Norbert Németh, Head of Department, Department of Operative Techniques and Surgical Research Faculty of Medicine, University of Debrecen

Dr. Árpád Rózsa, student, University of Szeged, Albert Szent-Györgyi Medical School

**MAB Coordinator supporting the procedure:** Dr. Ágnes Bálint

### IV. Evaluation

#### IV.1 Educational programme

##### Standard 2.2 Development and review of the educational programme

*The medical school has clear and transparent processes for the development, approval and periodic review of its educational programme.*

##### *Evaluation:*

The Self-Evaluation Report has been approved. The UPMS Basic Medical Program is compliant with the WFME Basic Medical Education Standards, meets the criteria of the QF-EHEA second-cycle programme, European Qualifications Framework Level 7, EU's special regulations for medical education, and the UNESCO ISCED Level 7 long-duration programme.

##### *Recommendation(s):*

- It would be highly beneficial to include the qualification description codes in the official programme documentation provided for students.
- An internal official self-evaluation of Basic Medical Education Programme is recommended, led by the Dean as Program Director, and aligned with the WFME Standards (seven criteria). The recent MAB-type description should be amended to comply with the WFME standards.
- Establishing a Standing Stakeholder Committee is recommended to advise on and evaluate programme quality. This committee should maintain formal records of discussions and ensure transparent decision-making regarding what is accepted or rejected, with clear justification.

## Standard 2.3 Educational, teaching and pedagogical methods used to deliver the educational programme

*The medical school employs a range of educational methods to ensure the acquisition of the competences defined in the programme and outcome requirements and the achievement of the learning outcomes set out in the educational programme.*

### *Evaluation:*

The Self-Evaluation Report has been approved. The University of Pécs Medical School Program is compliant with WFME standards.

### *Recommendation(s):*

- The UPMS programme description should be amended to include
  - The programme's position within the institutional strategy.
  - A clear description of the chosen model of outcome-based education (OBE), whether traditional, profession-centered or transformative.
  - Expected learning outcomes and any necessary adjustments.
  - A review of all subject descriptions to ensure alignment with competency requirements.
- The Program Director (Dean) should determine the accepted instructional and learning styles for the main modules, based on the outcomes of PotePillar development actions.
- Subject or course descriptions require standardisation and continuous review, using the MAB template for all subjects at level EQF Level 7 . Some subject descriptions currently lack sufficient detail and professionalism regarding competency outcomes.

## IV.2 Evaluation process of the educational programme

### Standard 3.1 System of assessment

*The medical school defines and publishes its student assessment principles, methods, practices and requirements. It maintains a system of requirements and assessment that allows for the provision of regular feedback to students regarding the effectiveness of the learning process. The assessment system used by the medical school is based on uniform principles that ensure that only suitable students will obtain a professional qualification.*

### *Evaluation:*

UPMS is compliant with the WFME standard on student assessment across its Hungarian, English, and German medical programs. The faculty has clearly defined and publicly accessible regulations detailing the principles, methods, and requirements for student evaluation. Key assessment policies (e.g., prerequisites for course registration and examination rules) are codified in university and faculty documents and disseminated to students via the Registrar's Office ("Tanulmányi Hivatal"). The curriculum and assessment system are structured to provide regular and timely feedback on learning progress: for instance, each mandatory course requires at least two mid-term assessments to monitor student performance and give ongoing feedback. Assessment methods are aligned with learning

outcomes and designed with student input – notably, student representatives (including the English-German Student Council for international programs) participate in curriculum committees and educational forums to help shape fair and relevant examinations. The faculty’s assessment practices emphasize transparency, consistency, and rigor. Examination formats and grading practices follow uniform principles that uphold high standards: all critical exam information and schedules are published openly, and exam procedures (such as question bank maintenance and statistical analysis of test results) are maintained to meet international requirements. Crucially, UPMS ensures that only students fit to practice are certified by implementing strict progression criteria and robust final assessments. Final (graduation) examinations include both practical and oral components evaluated by a board of 3–5 examiners, which must include at least one external member independent of the faculty. The faculty also contributes to a national standardized final exam question bank to benchmark and uphold competency standards. Overall, based on the self-assessment (Section 3.1), UPMS has an integrated and well-regulated assessment system that meets WFME standards by providing clear assessment criteria, ongoing feedback, and reliable certification of competence for all students in its Hungarian, English, and German programs.

#### *Recommendation(s):*

- **Expand Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCE):** Expedite the implementation of modern assessment methods like OSCE (already under consideration in the POTE Pillars strategy) to strengthen the evaluation of clinical skills and ensure that practical competencies are rigorously assessed.
- **Enhance Formative Assessment and Feedback:** Introduce more frequent formative assessments (e.g., regular quizzes, progress tests, or practical skill check-points) with timely, constructive feedback in all three language programs.
- **Continuous Quality Improvement:** Establish a formal mechanism (or strengthen the existing one) for regular review of assessment outcomes and examiner practices across programs. This could include periodic training workshops for examiners (to promote consistency and objectivity in grading across Hungarian, English, and German courses) and ongoing collaboration with national/international benchmarking efforts. By systematically analyzing exam results and incorporating external benchmarks (such as the national final exam performance), the faculty can identify areas for refinement and keep the assessment system aligned with global best practices, further ensuring that only well-qualified students are certified.

### **IV.3 Quality assurance**

#### **Standard 7 Quality assurance**

*The medical school has a quality assurance organisation and quality assurance processes and documents that support the implementation of its educational programme.*

#### *Evaluation:*

The internal Quality Assurance System must be publicly accessible and available to all internal and external stakeholders. It was suggested that the current coding system be discontinued. The UPMS during the monitoring process made it openly accessible.

UPMS maintains compliance with ISO 9001:2015 and EFQM 2025 standards. The former should only apply to the Quality Office if replaced by ISO 21001: 2025, which is designed for small educational organisations as a document classification system. EFQM 2025 provides a management framework for self-evaluation of school management activities. Both standards include mandatory procedures that offer a foundation for higher education quality processes; however, they are insufficient on their own. Current compliance is partial.

### *Recommendation(s):*

- Neither the ISO business standards, nor the EFQM management framework fully meet the requirements of ESG 2015 and WFME medical education standards. Therefore, the university should develop an Internal Quality Assurance Framework Model that integrates ESG 2015 standards with the WFME standards family.
- The Model Criteria may be applied at programme or school level. As UPMS offers programs beyond medical education, it is recommended to combine global WFME and ESG systems. Each criterion in the UPMS model description could include RADAR or PDCA-type elements:
  - Approaches to criteria: policy documents.
  - Form of policy: strategic documents, policy decisions, procedure descriptions, regulations, etc., and the level of action (School, Dean's Office, institute, Quality Office).
  - Main type of actions: introduction, delivery, and measurement of quality in implementation.
  - Quality checking techniques and tools.
  - Policy refinement: for continuous quality improvement.
- The EFQM tools and techniques are highly advanced, they can be incorporated into the description of criteria.

### **Proposed Pilot Model for UPMS Internal Quality Assurance Framework**

The WFME Master Standards are excellence-oriented and should form the core of the model, structured and supplemented with ESG criteria (2.1-2.10).

1. Basic Data (Programme/School) – key facts, annual update table (EFQM Key Data).
2. Directions:
  - Vision, mission, stakeholder management (EFQM aim-forming tools);
  - Governance of the schools (autonomy);

- Programme governance (autonomy and hard decision-making).
3. Programme Planning - philosophy, curriculum planning, delivery, and evaluation:
    - Bachelor, Master;
    - Long-duration Master's programmes (medical and dentist education);
    - Postgraduate, CPD for practicing doctors;
    - PhD students (WFME/ORPHEUS);
    - Habilitation;
    - Internationalized programmes in cooperation.
  4. Program Delivery:
    - Outcome-based education (explicit and implicit curriculum);
    - Delivery of different type of modules, delivery in different modalities;
    - Instructional system, training for instruction, innovations for training;
    - Evaluation: course, module, program, student, school assessment;
    - Student management, segmentation, counselling, advising, mentoring.
  5. Research Services (WFME PGME standard):
    - Basic and applied research;
    - PhD programmes;
    - Clinical and user-centred research;
    - European research standards (HR4R, CoARA).
  6. Academic Staff Strategy and Services.
  7. Resources for Teaching, Learning, Research, and Clinical Operation.
  8. Information System and Services – for students, teachers, external stakeholders, faculty, and clinics.
  9. Public Information Systems – for recruitment, public engagement, and stakeholder communication.
  10. International and National Networking – mobility, joint and double degrees.
  11. Partnerships with Clinics and Local Medical Institutions.
  12. Quality Management Services for faculty and programmes:
    - Quality checks (WFME/ESG compliance – gap analysis, PDCA analysis, improvement actions and results);
    - Quality improvement actions recommended by the Standing Stakeholder Committee;
    - Quality monitoring tools;



- Quality research and measures, stakeholder satisfaction;
  - Official programme evaluation by stakeholders;
  - Strategic and quality planning method and tools;
  - Knowledge base on WFME/ESG quality standards;
  - Training for faculty experts and Quality Office staff on WFME/ESG standards;
  - Quality documentation for accreditation.
13. Programme Self-Evaluation and Internal Accreditation Procedures.
  14. Standing Stakeholder Group Policy.
  15. External accreditation Evaluation:
    - Monitoring reports;
    - Self-evaluation reports;
    - Award and label simulation evaluations (e.g., ORPHEUS PhD).

## V. Summarized evaluation regarding the standards involved in the monitoring process

	STANDARD		ASSESSMENT		
	NO.	TOPIC	COMPLIANT	PARTIALLY COMPLIANT	NON-COMPLIANT
QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES	2.2	Development and review of the educational programme	✓		
	7.	Quality assurance		✓	
SUPPORT PROCESSES	2.3	Educational methods used to deliver the educational programme	✓		
	3.1	System of assessment	✓		