

**Section 4: Student representation,
evaluation and complaints**

Policy on Module Evaluation

[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. This document is concerned with students' evaluation of modules. 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*. Further information on programme evaluation is under development as of August 2017.
2. The primary purpose of module evaluation is the enhancement of the student experience of teaching and learning. It enables purposeful reflection on teaching and learning, and is a reflective and developmental process for both staff and student. Module evaluations are a key element of a School's partnership with its students, and are considered by Student-Staff Liaison Committees and Boards of Studies, and are reported to School Boards for Teaching and Learning and contribute to the quality assurance and enhancement cycle.
3. Module 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 module evaluations are not a formal performance indicator for staff, they should inform discussions about staff achievements and about training and development needs.
4. It should be noted that there is some evidence to suggest that, in the sector generally, module evaluations may reflect a range of biases in relation to gender and ethnicity, and that data from module evaluations should be used with due caution.
5. 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

6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. Normally, School Directors of Teaching and Learning (SDTL), acting on behalf of the SBTL, determines which modules fall within categories (7.ii) and (7.iii).
10. 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.
11. The questionnaires contain 10 core questions (under development as of August 2017), 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. It has been agreed that the University will move towards module evaluation which, in the case of multi-lecturer modules, accommodates the possibility that questions are asked in relation to each of the contributors to the module. General feedback for a multi-lecturer module yields limited useful information, since it is not clear whether students have based their response on a single lecturer or an average across the contributors. Questions which allow responses in relation to each contributor would allow students' responses to be interpreted more accurately, and teaching and learning strengths and potential development opportunities to be identified.

Administration and Student Engagement

15. The ambition of the University is to transition to online surveys as a default in the near future, with module convenors having the option to opt out to paper surveys. It is recommended that module convenors contact CQSD if accessibility to online surveys is an issue, and alternative arrangements may be sought.
16. 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 module convenor/lecturer should ensure that he/she is 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 module convenor/lecturer 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 Course 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.

Reporting of module evaluation

17. 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
 - (ii) SDTL for the School which owns the module
 - (iii) DDTL of the Department which owns the module
18. 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.
19. 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 Student-Staff Liaison Committee and Board of Studies (with onward transmission to the SBTL). The Module Convenor is responsible for uploading 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.

20. The following will be submitted to the Student-Staff Liaison Committee and the relevant Board of Studies, and onward to the School Board for Teaching and Learning:
 - (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.
21. 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.
22. Module convenors are responsible for arranging the commentary to be loaded onto Blackboard, and to provide a copy for use in SSLCs, BoS and SBTL.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. At the next opportunity following its consideration of the data from module evaluation, the BoS will report on module evaluation to the SBTL.
26. The BoS will also include in its Annual Programme Report (APR) a brief analysis of the data from the module evaluation. The APR 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.
27. 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.
28. 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.
29. 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.
30. 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
31. 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.

Mid-module evaluation

32. In addition to the requirements set out above in relation to end-of-module evaluation, all Schools are strongly encouraged to undertake some form of informal, light-touch mid-module evaluation for all modules on an annual basis. This can 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.
33. 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 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;
 - (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;
 - (iv) Through the use of EvaSys.

Version	Keeper	Reviewed	Approved by	Approval Date	Effective From
1	AGS	Every year	UBTL	16/05/2017	2017/18