

Section 4: Student representation,
evaluation and complaints

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]

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.

Principles and Purpose

1. The University seeks and obtains feedback from its students in a range of ways and at a number of levels. These include module and programme evaluations, Student-Staff Partnership (SSP) Groups, Boards of Studies and Student Experience (BoSSE) and other committees, and purposeful opportunities for informal dialogue. For further information on the operation of SSP Groups and student representation on other committees, please refer to the policy on [Student 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 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 SSP Groups and BoSSE, and contribute to the enhancement-led quality assurance cycle. They may also inform the accreditation of programmes (where applicable).
3. Student Evaluation offers evidence of effectiveness and impact in teaching and learning and should be used to inform priorities and provide evidence of progress/impact for School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans. It may also be used to 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.

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.
4. Letting students know how their feedback has been acted on is an integral part of the evaluation process. Closing the feedback loop can promote student-staff dialogue and create a climate where staff and students see the value of the evaluation process.
5. This Policy covers three forms of student evaluation: mid-module evaluation; end-of-module evaluation; and programme evaluation.

- Mid-module evaluation provides formative feedback from students which can benefit the current cohort.

- End-of 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 inclusivity of the programme (i.e. the extent to which the programme meets the need of all students)
 - the range and balance of pedagogic approaches and assessments across the programme
 - and the extent to which the programme has enabled all 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.

Frequency and Structure

Mid-module evaluation

6. All Schools must 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.
7. 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 tool (e.g. [Microsoft Forms](#), 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).

End-of-Module Evaluation

8. 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.
9. Schools are normally required to evaluate each of their modules annually; however if there are no concerns this could be reduced to every two years, subject to approval from the School Director of Teaching and Learning (SDTL), acting on behalf of BoSSE.
10. BoSSE will have oversight of evaluations for modules within their remit. End-of-module evaluation Reports should be available in full to External Examiners (including descriptive statistics on the quantitative questions, together with the student responses to the open-ended questions) and may be considered in internal enhancement-led quality assurance processes, such as the six-yearly Periodic Review process.

11. The University's end-of-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.
12. The questionnaires comprise of a set of core questions, in both quantitative (general scaled) and qualitative (open-ended) format. Schools also have the option to include 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 core questions will be reviewed on a two-yearly basis by the Sub-Committee on Delivery and Enhancement of Teaching and Learning.
13. 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 summatively.
14. 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

15. 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.
16. Schools are required to evaluate their programme(s) annually. 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 towards the end of a programme, at a point to be determined by the Programme Director, when:
 - (i) students will have had sufficient time and necessary experiences to reflect;
 - (ii) it might be reasonable to expect levels of completion that can provide valid data; and,
 - (iii) colleagues will be able to respond to evaluations to inform future iterations of/practice on programmes.
17. BoSSE will have oversight of evaluations for programmes within their remit.
18. The structure and method of evaluation of programme(s) 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(s). This could include focus groups, questionnaires, or a combination of methods. Programme Directors might find it helpful to refer to the [Programme Evaluation Guidance](#).
19. The focus of the evaluation of programme(s) 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 all students feel they have been able to meet the programme learning outcomes and to develop relevant graduate attributes; the extent to which the programme(s) as a whole meets the needs of all students. Programme evaluation can also be purposefully designed to monitor progress and provide evidence of impact against relevant programme level activities in School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans.

Administration and Student Engagement

20. EvaSys supports both paper-based and online surveys. The ambition of the University is to use online surveys as a default for end-of-module evaluation, 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.
21. The University has established a set of good practice principles to guide Schools in respect of EvaSys 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.
22. Guidance on evaluation methods (e.g. focus groups) is available on the [Evaluation and Impact website](#) under Methods/Guides. A range of self-access resources/screencasts on "Designing and Facilitating Focus Groups for Programme Evaluation" is also available via [UoR Learn](#).

Reporting and closing the feedback loop

Mid-Module evaluation

23. Module convenors must ensure that timely action is taken in response to mid-module evaluation and communicate and share the outcomes with all students enrolled on the module. There are often valid reasons why student feedback cannot be acted upon. Sharing the reasons for issues you are unable address is equally important as communicating what action will be taken. Module convenors may find it helpful to refer to the guidance on [Closing the Feedback Loop](#).
24. Results of mid-module evaluation will be retained by the Module Convenor and Programme Director.
25. Results of mid-module evaluation are to be used for developmental purposes only within the owning Department/School.

End-of-Module evaluation

26. CQSD will send reports with the results of the end-of-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
27. 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, for example for Combined Programmes and shared modules which are delivered by one or more contributing Departments/Schools.
28. Module Convenors are required to write a brief commentary on the end-of-module evaluation, including a brief synopsis of students' responses to open-ended questions. This commentary should include a summary of strengths/positive aspects identified, a response to the feedback and issues raised, and should indicate any actions to be taken and/or areas for enhancement in the light of issues raised or suggestions for improvement made by students. It should also explain if there are issues on which the School is unable to take action in a way which meets student' expectations and the reasons behind this. Module Convenors may also find it helpful to refer to guidance on [Closing the Feedback Loop](#).
29. The Module Convenor's commentary and the results of the general scaled questions (i.e. not those which relate to an individual tutor/lecturer and not the qualitative questions) will be published on the Blackboard site for the module. 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) to make it available to those students who were invited to take part in the evaluation. In addition, the Module Convenor's commentary (but not the report containing the results of the general scaled questions) should be retained following Blackboard Course Rollover so subsequent cohorts have access. This will serve to increase the transparency about how the module has changed in response to student feedback from previous cohorts and demonstrate how staff value students' views and opinions; prompt ongoing staff-student dialogue; and help students understand persistent issues on which the School is unable to act and the reasons behind this.
30. Separate end-of-module evaluations take place at branch campuses, and 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 SSP Group and the relevant BoSSE:
- (i) A compilation of the results of the general quantitative questions (i.e. not those which relate to an individual tutor/lecturer and not the qualitative questions);
These will be provided by CQSD to the Support Centre for use by the Secretary to the SSP Group and BoSSE.
 - (ii) Module Convenors' commentaries.
Module Convenors / Leads are responsible for arranging for the commentary to be loaded onto Blackboard, and for providing a copy for use in SSP Group, BoSSE and other committees as relevant.
32. The order in which the SSP Group and the BoSSE 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 BoSSE to take into account comments from the SSP Group. The outcomes of end-of-module evaluation may inform priorities and provide evidence of progress/impact for School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans.
33. The Module Convenor's commentary may need to be supplemented in the light of any comment or decisions by the BoSSE and the revised version uploaded to Blackboard.

34. DELT and UBTLSE will have access to quantitative data from end-of-module evaluation on request. Quantitative data may also be used for cross-university comparisons to inform institutional enhancement of Teaching and Learning. UBTLSE reports to the Senate on issues and enhancements related to teaching and learning which may be informed by the end-of-module evaluation process.
35. Reference to the end-of-module evaluation process will be included in the Annual Learning and Teaching Report for Council.
36. All leadership roles will have the right of access to relevant end-of-module evaluation data (including responses to open-ended questions), primarily for the oversight of the student academic experience.
37. Periodic Review panels will consider the effectiveness of the module evaluation process in a School and will have access to data from end-of-module evaluation (normally in the form of aggregated reports, but detailed reports, if requested), together with Module Convenors' commentaries.

Programme Evaluation

38. 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. The SDTL and Head of School are responsible for forwarding raw data onto colleagues within Senior Management Board where necessary. Where a Programme is delivered at a branch campus, relevant data will also be shared and discussed with the Programme Lead.
39. 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, drawing out the key considerations that need to be acted upon and noting suggestions for changes to the programme(s).
40. The Summary Report will be reviewed by the SSP Group, Programme Team and BoSSE and any actions identified and agreed. The outcomes of this process may inform priorities and provide evidence of progress/impact against relevant programme level activities in School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans.
41. The Summary Report and associated actions will also be sent, on request, to relevant Programme Directors and to SDTLs for non-owning Schools which have an interest in the Programme.
42. The Programme Director will be responsible for uploading the Summary Report and associated actions to Blackboard so that it is generally available to students in the School/Department for a maximum period of three years. Programme Directors may also find it helpful to refer to guidance on [Closing](#) the Feedback Loop.
43. Reference to the programme evaluation process will be included in the Annual Learning and Teaching Report for Council.
44. Periodic Review panels will consider the effectiveness of the programme evaluation process in a School, and will have access to Summary Reports and associated actions, but not to raw data.

Version	Keeper	Reviewed	Approved by	Approval Date	Effective From	Next Review
1	AGS	Every year	UBTL	16/05/2017	2017/18	
2	AGS		UBTL	12/06/2018	2018/19	
3	CQSD		UBTLSE	07/07/2020	2020/21 Academic Session	
4	CQSD	Every 3 years	UBTLSE	25/01/2021	2021/22 Academic Session	Spring 2023

	Mid Module Evaluation	End-of-Module Evaluation Using	Programme Evaluation
Who is responsible for carrying out evaluations?	Module Convenor	<p>CQSD has responsibility for generating questionnaires and producing results.</p> <p>Schools have responsibility for issuing and returning questionnaires.</p> <p>BoSSE have oversight of evaluations for modules within their remit.</p>	<p>Programme Directors are responsible for ensuring that their programmes are evaluated annually in accordance with the Policy and Guidance.</p> <p>Oversight rests with the relevant BoSSE.</p>
How will evaluation be undertaken/data be collected? What type of data is required?	<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 MS Forms or 'free' apps for quiz creation (e.g. Menti) administered using mobile phone responses during a lecture.</p>	EvaSys: paper-based or online questionnaires	<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>Programme Directors might find it helpful to refer to the Programme Evaluation Guidance.</p> <p>The minimum expectation is that Schools will meet the distinct purposes of programme evaluation as set out in the Policy.</p>
	Post-it and flip-chart method; for example, students are asked to note what is working well on the module and what, if		BoSSE are required 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.

	Mid Module Evaluation	End-of-Module Evaluation Using	Programme Evaluation
When will evaluation take place?	At the mid-point of a module as determined by the Module Convenor	At the end of a module	Towards 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.
How frequently will evaluation take place?	At least once per delivery of a module	Annually	Annually
How, by whom and where will data be analysed and interpreted?	Module Convenor	Module Convenor	Programme Director
How, by whom and where will data be reported/accessed?	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 the results of the core quantitative questions for modules in a School, for use by the Secretary to the SSP Group and BoSSE.</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 considered by the SSP Group, Programme team and BoSSE and any actions identified and agreed. The outcomes of this process may inform priorities and provide evidence of progress/impact against relevant programme level activities in School Teaching Enhancement Action Plans. The Summary Report and associated actions will also be shared with participants.</p>

	Mid Module Evaluation	End-of-Module Evaluation Using	Programme Evaluation
How will the feedback loop be closed?	Module convenors must ensure that timely action is taken in response to mid-module evaluation and communicate and share the outcomes with all students enrolled on the module.	Module Convenor's commentary and the results of the quantitative questions will be published on Blackboard. Commentaries (not the results of the quantitative questions) will be available for subsequent cohorts.	The Summary Report and associated actions will be uploaded to Blackboard. Participants who had graduated, and other alumni of programmes will have access to the outcomes on request.