

# Policy on Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning

*[For the purposes of the processes described in this document, in Henley Business School the Director of Studies will be fulfilling the functions of the School Director of Teaching and Learning, and the Teaching and Learning Quality Sub-Committee will be fulfilling the functions of the School Board for Teaching and Learning]*

## Principles and Purpose

1. The University seeks and obtains feedback from its students in a range of ways and at a number of levels. This includes module questionnaires, programme evaluations, Student/Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC), Boards of Studies (BoS) and other committees, discussion and feedback sessions and informal dialogue. For further information on the operation of Student/Staff Liaison Committees and student representation on other committees, please refer to the policy on *Student Academic Representation*.
2. The primary purpose of student evaluation is the enhancement of the student experience of teaching and learning. It provides opportunities for staff and students to work in partnership to identify “what works” and to support enhancement of teaching and learning. It enables purposeful reflection on teaching and learning, and is a reflective and developmental process for both staff and students. Evaluations are a key element of a School’s partnership with its students, and are considered by Student-Staff Liaison Committees, Boards of Studies, and School Boards for Teaching and Learning (SBTL) and contribute to the quality assurance and enhancement cycle. They may also inform the accreditation of programmes (where applicable).
3. This Policy covers three forms of student evaluation: mid-module evaluation; module evaluation; and, programme evaluation. Mid-module evaluation provides formative feedback from students which can benefit the current cohort. Module evaluation provides feedback from students to support the enhancement of future iterations of the module. Programme evaluation goes beyond aggregating the student feedback gained at module level to provide feedback on the programme as a whole, for example: the coherence of the programme; the range and balance of pedagogic approaches and assessments across the programme; and, the extent to which the programme has enabled students to demonstrate programme learning outcomes and to develop the Graduate Attributes (as specified in the Curriculum Framework). For a comparison of the three forms of student

evaluation, please see Appendix 1.

4. Evaluation offers evidence of effectiveness and impact in teaching and learning, and may be used to inform and support applications for teaching awards, HEA fellowship and promotion. While evaluations are not a formal performance indicator for staff, they should inform discussions about staff achievements and about training and development needs.
5. It should be noted that there is some evidence to suggest that, in the sector generally, evaluations may reflect a range of biases in relation to gender and ethnicity, and that data from evaluations should be used with due caution.
6. This policy applies to undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. It also applies to taught modules offered within professional doctorate programmes. This policy does not apply to sessions offered in the Researcher Development Programme nor to the evaluation of doctoral programmes, which is fulfilled through processes developed by the Graduate School.

## Frequency and Structure

### Mid-module evaluation

7. All Schools will undertake some form of informal, light-touch mid-module evaluation for all modules on an annual basis. This form of evaluation will be particularly useful in the resolution of practical and operational issues and provides an opportunity for Module Convenors to react quickly and efficiently to feedback from students and to make (minor) changes which will benefit the current cohort.
8. Module Convenors may wish to select from a variety of methods of mid-module evaluation, including (but not restricted to):
  - (i) verbal feedback gathered informally by an academic member of staff with no responsibility for the module under review or by a Course Rep during a lecture;
  - (ii) use of an online survey (e.g. Meeto, Socrative, Mentimeter);
  - (iii) Post-it and flip-chart method; for example, students are asked to note what is working well on the module and what, if anything, could be improved;

(Module Convenors might find it helpful to refer to the Guidance on Peer Review of Learning and Teaching, points 14-16:

<http://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/qualitysupport/peerreviewguidance.pdf>)

### Module Evaluation

9. Whilst supporting the appropriate use of a range of formal and informal feedback mechanisms in Schools, the University's policy is that formal end-of-module evaluation in the form of module questionnaires is an essential component of the student feedback process.
10. Schools are required to evaluate each of their modules at least every two years. They are **not** expected to evaluate all their modules every year, although annual evaluation is required for a period of three years for modules in the following

categories:

- (i) new modules;
  - (ii) modules which have undergone significant changes;
  - (iii) modules where significant concerns have been raised, for example by SSLCs, a Periodic Review panel or by previous module evaluations.
11. Boards of Studies will have oversight of evaluations for modules within their remit and will be responsible for determining the cycle of module evaluations and any underlying rationale. This information should be available for External Examiners and may be considered in internal monitoring and review processes, such as the six-yearly Periodic Review process and Annual Quality Assurance Report.
  12. Normally, School Directors of Teaching and Learning (SDTLs), acting on behalf of SBTLs, determine which programmes fall within categories (10.ii) and (10.iii).
  13. The University's module evaluation process is supported by EvaSys student evaluation software. EvaSys allows students' feedback on modules to be collected either online or via a paper form which is scanned and the data added to the online repository. Students are asked to respond using a five-point Likert scale and are also given the option of offering responses to open-ended questions.
  14. The questionnaires contain 10 core questions, with Schools having the option of including up to 5 additional questions drawn from a bank of optional questions. The questions include some opportunity for students to reflect on their own learning. The 10 core questions will be reviewed on a two-yearly basis by the Sub-Committee on Delivery and Enhancement of Teaching and Learning.
  15. It is recognised that questions included in the questionnaire are appropriate to the students' experience of the module to date, and that, in consequence, careful consideration needs to be given to questions relating to assessment, if the student has not yet been assessed.
  16. Adoption of this evaluation method is intended to ensure a clear understanding of fundamental issues for the student experience, and a transparent approach and a degree of consistency across Schools. It enables cross-institution comparison of data obtained through the core questions, whilst recognising the need for flexibility to address module-specific issues.

## Programme Evaluation

17. Whilst supporting the appropriate use of a range of formal and informal feedback mechanisms in Schools, the University's policy is that some form of formal programme evaluation is an essential component of the student feedback process.
18. Schools are required to evaluate their programmes annually at the end of each programme. This enables the aggregate data across cohorts to inform any significant changes that might better be informed by trends over time (to limit the impact of the cohort effect). Programme evaluation should be conducted annually at the end of a programme, at a point to be determined by the Programme Director, when:
  - (a) students will have had sufficient time and necessary experiences to reflect;
  - (b) it might be reasonable to expect levels of completion that can provide valid data; and,

- (c) colleagues will be able to respond to evaluations to inform future iterations of/practice on programmes.
19. SBTs will have oversight of evaluations for programmes within their remit.
  20. The structure and method of evaluation of programmes will be at the discretion of Programme Directors according to the nature of the information and feedback to be ascertained and the form of student engagement that is most appropriate to the particular programme. This could include focus groups, EvaSys, questionnaires, or a combination of methods.
  21. The focus of the evaluation of programmes will include: programme coherence; progression; the range and balance of pedagogic approaches and assessment; feedback on activities such as placements, field trips and study abroad; the degree of flexibility for students to build/tailor their programmes and how they were able to exercise this level of choice; the extent to which students feel they have been able to meet the programme learning outcomes and to develop relevant graduate attributes; the extent to which the programme as a whole met students' needs.

## Administration and Student Engagement

22. The ambition of the University is to transition to online surveys as a default in the near future, with Module Convenors/Programme Directors having the option to opt out to paper surveys. It is recommended that Module Convenors/Programme Directors contact CQSD if accessibility to online surveys is an issue, and alternative arrangements may be sought.
23. The University has established a set of good practice principles to guide Schools in respect of questionnaire administration as follows:
  - (i) Where online questionnaire methods are employed within a class setting, the person administering the questionnaire should ensure that they are clearly positioned out of the line of vision of students' PC/laptop/mobile phone screens;
  - (ii) In order to maximise completion rates for electronic surveys, the person administering the questionnaire should encourage students to access Blackboard via a smart phone or tablet in the lecture/seminar/workshop (it should be noted that the Blackboard app does not currently support the link to EvaSys);
  - (iii) In circumstances where paper questionnaires are being used, questionnaires should be distributed towards the beginning of the lecture/seminar/workshop to prevent the tendency to complete questionnaires in haste at the end of a session;
  - (iv) Where paper questionnaires are being used, a Student Rep or a nominated student should be responsible for collecting the completed questionnaires and taking them to the relevant Support Centre in order to preserve anonymity and encourage honest and constructive feedback;
  - (v) Schools should aim for a minimum completion rate of 50%. Where small cohorts are involved, it may be necessary to aim for a higher rate

of completion.

24. The University has provided training and guidance in good practice for the operation of focus groups and it is essential that facilitators will be trained before conducting focus groups for the purpose of student evaluation.

## Reporting

### Mid-Module evaluation

25. Results of mid-module evaluation will be retained by the Module Convenor and Programme Director.
26. Results of mid-module evaluation are to be used for developmental purposes only within the owning Department/School.

### Module evaluation

27. CQSD will send reports with the results of the module evaluation showing descriptive statistics on the quantitative questions, together with the student responses to the open-ended questions to the following:
- (i) Module Convenor, and Module Lead where the module delivery takes place at two different locations ie: UoR and a Branch Campus
  - (ii) SDTL for the School which owns the module
  - (iii) DDTL of the Department which owns the module
28. Reports will also be sent, on request, to relevant Programme Directors and to SDTLs for non-owning Schools which have an interest in the module.
29. Module Convenors are required to write a brief commentary on the module evaluation, providing a synopsis of the responses to open-ended questions, responding to the feedback and issues raised, and indicating any actions to be taken in the light of the feedback. The Module Convenor's commentary and the results of the general scaled questions (i.e. those which do not relate to an individual tutor/lecturer) will be published on the Blackboard site for the module and will be submitted to the SSLC and BoS (with onward transmission to the SBTL). The Module Convenor is responsible for uploading the results of the scaled questions and the commentary to Blackboard (with support from the Support Centre, as requested). The posting of the results of module evaluation and the Module Convenor's commentary on Blackboard makes it available to those students who were invited to take part in the evaluation.
30. Where a module evaluation takes place at a branch campus, the Module Lead should also receive the quantitative data and student responses for the branch campus delivery, and should discuss this feedback with the Module Convenor to inform the module evaluation analysis.
31. The following will be submitted to the SSLC and the relevant BoS, and onward to the SBTL:
- (i) results of the general scaled questions (i.e. those which do not relate to an individual tutor/lecturer), without the responses to open-ended questions;
  - (ii) Module Convenors' commentaries.

32. A compilation of the results of the core quantitative questions (without responses to open-ended questions) for modules in a School will be provided by CQSD to the Support Centre for use by the Secretary to the SSLC, BoS, and SBTL.
33. Module Convenors / Leads are responsible for arranging for the commentary to be loaded onto Blackboard, and for providing a copy for use in SSLCs, BoS, SBTL, and Programme Boards as relevant.
34. The order in which the SSLC and the BoS consider this material may depend on the timing and order of the meetings. However the School should seek to balance the need for timely consideration by both, and the need for BoS to take into account comments from the SSLC.
35. The Module Convenor's commentary may need to be supplemented in the light of any comment or decisions by the BoS and the revised version uploaded to Blackboard.
36. At the next opportunity following its consideration of the data from module evaluation, the BoS will report on module evaluation to the SBTL.
37. The BoS will also include in its Annual Quality Assurance Report (AQAR) a brief analysis of the data from the module evaluation. The AQAR will be submitted to CQSD and issues identified for inclusion in the University Annual Quality Assurance Report to be considered by DELT and by UBTL. The module evaluation process may be referenced in, but will not form a major part of, the School Planning and Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (SPELT) process.
38. DELT and UBTL will have access to quantitative data from module evaluation on request. Quantitative data will also be used for cross-university comparisons to inform institutional enhancement of Teaching and Learning. UBTL will report to the Senate on the module evaluation process and any themes arising from it.
39. Reference to the module evaluation process and any themes arising from it will be included in the Annual Report on Quality, Standards and the Student Academic Experience for submission to the Council.
40. All leadership roles will have the right of access to relevant module evaluation data (including responses to open-ended questions), primarily for the oversight of the student academic experience.
41. Module evaluation data will not routinely be made available to students who were not enrolled on the evaluated module (e.g. for the purposes of module choice). Additionally, Module evaluation data will not routinely be available for subsequent cohorts since the information would be historic and would not reflect amendments to the module and its delivery, and would therefore be potentially misleading
42. Periodic Review panels will consider the effectiveness of the module evaluation process in a School, and will have access to data from module evaluation, together with Module Convenors' commentaries.

## **Programme Evaluation**

43. Results of programme evaluation will be analysed and interpreted by the Programme Director. The sharing of raw data is to be strictly controlled and restricted to the Programme Director, SDTL, Head of School and, in the case of focus groups, the participants. Where a Programme is delivered at a branch

campus, relevant data will also be shared and discussed with the Programme Lead.

44. Programme Directors will prepare a short Summary Report for wider circulation. The Summary Report will include a commentary and provide an overview of the evaluation data, including positive feedback, for each programme, drawing out the key considerations that need to be acted upon and noting suggestions for changes to the programme(s).
45. The Summary Report will be reviewed at the final BoS of the academic year and an Action Plan will be agreed which will feed into the AQAR and onward to the SBTL.
46. The Summary Report and Action Plan will also be sent, on request, to relevant Programme Directors and to SDTLs for non-owning Schools which have an interest in the Programme.
47. The Action Plan will be shared with the SSLC and with participants.
48. The Programme Director will be responsible for uploading the Action Plan to Blackboard.
49. Reference to the programme evaluation process and any themes arising from it will be included in the Annual Report on Quality, Standards and the Student Academic Experience for submission to the Council.
50. Programme evaluation data will not routinely be made available to students who were not enrolled on the programme. Additionally, programme evaluation data will not routinely be available for subsequent cohorts.
51. The Action Plan will be shared with course reps and with the alumni of the particular cohort of the programme.
52. Periodic Review panels will consider the effectiveness of the programme evaluation process in a School, and will have access to Summary Reports and Action Plans, but not to raw data.

Version	Keeper	Reviewed	Approved by	Approval Date	Effective From
1	AGS	Every year	UBTL	16/05/2017	2017/18
2	AGS		UBTL	12/06/2018	2018/19

	<b>Mid Module Evaluation</b>	<b>Module Evaluation Using EvaSys</b>	<b>Programme Evaluation</b>
<b>Who is responsible for carrying out evaluations?</b>	Module Convenor	<p>CQSD has responsibility for generating questionnaires and producing results.</p> <p>Schools have responsibility for issuing and returning questionnaires</p> <p>Boards of Studies have oversight of evaluations for modules within their remit</p> <p>SDTLs on behalf of SBTLs determine which existing modules require annual evaluation</p>	Programme Directors are responsible for ensuring that their programmes are evaluated annually in accordance with the Policy and Guidance. Oversight rests with the SDTL.
<b>How will evaluation be undertaken/data be collected? What type of data is required?</b>	<p>Select from a variety of methods including:</p> <p>Verbal feedback gathered informally by an academic member of staff with no responsibility for the module under review or by a Course Rep during a lecture</p> <p>Use of the 'Poll Everywhere' tool administered using mobile phone responses during a lecture either via PowerPoint with no live feed or via a web connection with a monitored live feed;</p>	EvaSys	<p>Schools have flexibility to make choices in their approach to programme evaluation to enable them to collect the data that are pedagogically most useful and relevant for enhancement of their portfolio of programmes.</p> <p>In the case of EvaSys, a limited selection of questions would be available due to resource constraints within CQSD</p> <p>Guidance is available and the minimum expectation is that Schools will meet the distinct purposes of programme evaluation as set out in the Policy.</p>



	<b>Mid Module Evaluation</b>	<b>Module Evaluation Using EvaSys</b>	<b>Programme Evaluation</b>
	<p>Post-it and flip-chart method; for example, students are asked to note what is working well on the module and what, if anything, could be improved</p> <p>Through the use of EvaSys.</p>		<p>At an appropriately timed SBTL meeting, Schools would be required annually to give consideration as to what their approach to programme evaluation should be; to specifically agree how they take account of joint programmes and offshore delivery to ensure they are properly evaluated; and to inform the EvaSys team of their intentions.</p>
<b>When will evaluation take place?</b>	At the mid-point of a module as determined by the Module Convenor	At the end of a module	At the end of a programme at a point when students will have had sufficient and necessary experiences to reflect on and at a point in which it might be reasonable to expect levels of completion that can provide valid data. To be determined by Programme Directors
<b>How frequently will evaluation take place?</b>	At least once per delivery of a module	Every two years, but annually for new modules; modules which have undergone significant changes; modules where significant concerns have been raised	Annually
<b>How, by whom and where will data be analysed and interpreted?</b>	Modular Convenor	Module Convenor	Programme Director

	<b>Mid Module Evaluation</b>	<b>Module Evaluation Using EvaSys</b>	<b>Programme Evaluation</b>
<b>How, by whom and where will data be reported/accessed?</b>	Confined to the person delivering module for local use	<p>CQSD reports the results of module evaluation to the Module Convenor, the SDTL of the School which owns the module and the DDTL of the Department which owns the module</p> <p>On request, CQSD will send reports to the relevant Programme Directors and the SDTLs of non-owning Schools which have an interest in the module</p> <p>CQSD will provide the Support Centre with a compilation of results of the core quantitative questions for modules in a School, for use by the Secretary to the SSLC, BoS and SBTL</p>	<p>The sharing of raw data will be tightly controlled and restricted to the Programme Director, SDTL, HoS, and, in the case of focus groups, the participants</p> <p>The Programme Director will produce a short summary report for wider circulation.</p> <p>The summary report will be reviewed at the final BoS to form an Action Plan to feed into the AQAR and onward to SBTL. The Action Plan will be shared with the SSLCs, and with participants</p>
<b>How will the feedback loop be closed?</b>		Module Convenor's commentary and the results of general scaled questions will be published on Blackboard and will be submitted to the SSLC and BoS for onward transmission to the SBTL	Participants who had graduated, and other alumni of programmes, when providing informed consent would be asked to provide their email addresses so that outcomes could be shared. Alternatively, they might be signposted to contact details for current/future course reps.