

Module Evaluation Process Review update

The review on City's module evaluation process and operation is based on a detailed evaluation undertaken with colleagues in Schools, LEaD and Student and Academic Services, and feedback from staff and students. The review process evaluated the effectiveness of current practice to identify what is working well, and the challenges and opportunities for enhancement to ensure that module evaluation meets City's ongoing requirements and align with current priorities and external developments.

A draft of the report was shared with Associate Deans (Education), LEaD and Heads of Academic Services for comment. The attached version incorporates their feedback.

Educational Quality Committee are invited to consider

- the key findings and next steps outlined in the main report (see separate paper)
- the action plan (as attached)

Recommended actions

Educational Quality Committee is asked to:

- **consider** the report and proposed action plan
- **note** the proposed next steps

MODULE EVALUATION PROCESS REVIEW 2017/18 – ACTION PLAN

Proposed Recommendations and Actions for future development of module evaluation

Part 1.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF MODULE EVALUATION	<p>Recommendation 1: Module Evaluation Policy</p> <p>Module evaluation is used to produce data for a variety of purposes and greater transparency is needed to provide clarity with regard to the scope of the process and the use of data.</p>	<p>The primary purpose of module evaluation should be clarified and articulated in a Module Evaluation Policy.</p> <p>Specific guidelines to be agreed relating to the appropriate scope of use of data during staff appraisal and promotion.</p>	<p>Develop a Module Evaluation Policy to provide clarity on the purpose and approach.</p> <p><i>Note: the policy should reflect what City aims to achieve through module evaluation rather than focus on the process</i></p>
	<p>Recommendation 2: Clarity on parameters to be used for module evaluation</p> <p>Parameters for determining evaluation of modules and lecturers vary greatly; it would be helpful for expectations to be clarified in policy and guidance.</p> <p>Students are often being asked to complete several questionnaires for a single module which is repetitious and time-consuming. Feedback from Schools indicates that there is frequently confusion amongst staff and students about whether it is the module or the lecturer that is being evaluated. Some modules are currently excluded altogether. Guidance has been requested on management of e.g. large cohort sizes, evaluation of year-long modules.</p> <p>Feedback also indicates that there is uncertainty about who should be evaluated</p>	<p>Policy decisions to be made relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of modules with small cohorts, individual supervision or others currently excluded from surveys such as final year projects, in module evaluation • The maximum number of evaluations a student should complete for a single module (i.e. those with multiple lecturers, tutorial groups, 30 credits modules etc) to be informed by student feedback. • Confirmation of the requirements relating to evaluation of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lecturing Staff ○ Multiple lecturers ○ Visiting Lecturers ○ Teaching Assistants ○ PhD students ○ Dissertations/final year projects <p>In particular, guidance on the number/volume of teaching sessions are required to trigger the</p>	<p>Proposals to be in made liaison with stakeholders relating to the scope of modules and individual roles that should be evaluated, maximum evaluations per module, bespoke surveys for individuals and/or tutorials to inform the policy decision.</p>

Part 1.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
	<p>(based on e.g. the extent and nature of their involvement in a module, or exact requirements for HR purposes).</p> <p>Where module surveys are broken down to granular level (for split groups/tutorials/seminars etc), reporting directly correlates to each individual survey so it is difficult to assess the feedback for the module as a whole. Feedback from Schools indicates that data for modules as a whole is preferable to data for individual groups.</p> <p>It may be appropriate to develop a separate questionnaire for tutorials and seminars.</p>	<p>requirement for evaluation to provide clarity and manage expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formats for future surveys: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should multiple lecturers be combined on a single questionnaire to enable a single survey to be produced for each module (to reduce the survey burden on students) ○ Should lecturers and modules be evaluated separately to satisfy City's aims to evaluate, i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) all modules, enabling an overall single module evaluation result to be determined for each module and (2) separate forms for lecturers for appraisal/academic CV (e.g. by programme rather than individual module)? ○ Should a separate questionnaire be developed for tutorials/seminars to gather bespoke data on tutorials? • Data use: Guidance on the use of individual and aggregated scores in the Academic CV where modules are jointly taught should be agreed. • Student Feedback Policy to be reviewed and updated to ensure continuing alignment with City's KPIs. 	

Part 2.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	<p>Action 1: Guidance on the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders to be developed to support consistency of practice</p> <p>Effective module evaluation relies on participation by many academic and professional colleagues across City. Clarity on each person's responsibility is necessary to ensure that students have an opportunity to provide module feedback.</p> <p>If surveys do not take place or are returned late, the opportunity to respond and use it for future development is lost.</p>	<p>Continue the current regular liaison between Student and Academic Services, key School Quality contacts and Associate Deans Education to share practice and facilitate planning.</p> <p>Supplement the current technical guidance notes with information on roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.</p>	<p>Guidance on roles and responsibilities of stakeholders to be developed in liaison with stakeholders.</p>
Part 3.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT	<p>Action 2: Guidance on best practice for pre-survey communication to be shared</p> <p>Varied approaches to preparing staff and students for module evaluation for staff and students are taken.</p> <p>Sharing of best practice would facilitate a shared understanding of the purpose and process.</p>	<p>Establish communications plan with SU to publicise module evaluation at key points in the academic year and support information disseminated by Schools</p> <p>Production of updated guidelines to support staff and student understanding of the process</p> <p>Production of guidance notes for good practice on how to introduce module evaluation to students (with SU and Surveys Working Group and Communications Officer).</p>	<p>Guidance to be developed in liaison with key stakeholders</p>

Part 3.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
	<p>Action 3: Best practice to be developed on staff and student engagement</p> <p>Effective communication to students about action taken in response to their feedback is key to the student experience and engagement with module evaluation. Details of actions should be routinely shared with students as a cohort, and through the committee and quality reporting frameworks.</p>	<p>SU, SSLCs and Student Communications Officer to advise on the preferred methods, format and timing of feedback in response to actions.</p> <p>The practice of sharing module evaluation results with SSLCs and Programme Committees to be undertaken systematically by Schools, as soon as possible after the results.</p> <p>The APE form and guidance will be updated to prompt inclusion of detail on module evaluation actions.</p> <p>Policy and guidance documentation will be strengthened to support consistency of practice.</p>	<p>Guidance to be developed in liaison with key stakeholders to support staff and student engagement</p> <p>Feedback from students to be sought ascertain what students understand both the purpose of module evaluation and the survey questions to mean.</p> <p>Feedback from staff to inform guidance on staff engagement with module evaluation (paper-based or online methods as appropriate), which will need to be supported by a clear distinction between lecturer and module focussed questions, and clarity on the use of data.</p>

Part 4.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
DATA	<p>Recommendation 3: Improvement to data quality to be achieved</p> <p>The accuracy of the data held in SITS is crucial to the quality of the module evaluation process, as well as statutory reporting, timetabling and examination planning. Issues with the underlying data impacts on the accuracy of Senate reports and oversight of the process.</p>	<p>Collated issues to be shared with Schools for comments to inform proposals to inform the planned MAfS Management Information project</p> <p>Improve links with timetabling software to inform current module information</p> <p>Request for information on SITS to include modules name, code, contact house, exams info, lecturer and tutor info esp if shared teaching, and students enrolled – to avoid need for separate spreadsheets.</p>	<p>Liaison with Schools to be undertaken with Schools on how data quality can be improved and to highlight IT system limitations where applicable.</p> <p>Key findings to be shared with the MAfS Management Information project.</p>

Part 4.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
	<p>Action 5: Records management system requirements to be clarified</p> <p>Access to individual pdf reports within Schools currently varies.</p>	<p>Individual pdf reports should be cascaded via the appropriate departmental structures rather than be open access to staff not associated with the programmes.</p>	<p>Guidance to staff to be updated to ensure that appropriate access and data protection systems are implemented</p>

Part 5.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
<p>SURVEY TIMINGS AND FORMATS</p>	<p>Recommendation 4: Implement online surveys to reduce results production time and environmental impact</p> <p><i>Note: group/timetable information cannot be stored on SITS which would impact on ability to produce separate email lists for groups.</i></p>	<p>Adoption of online surveys to be completed in class or within an appropriate defined timeframe.</p> <p>Effective online surveys would need to be supported by specific software to facilitate student access to link directly with their surveys (avoiding multiple emails).</p>	<p>Development of guidance to support implementation and Cass PG online strategies to be shared across Schools.</p> <p>Consideration of updates to IT systems to facilitate adoption of online surveys.</p>
	<p>Recommendation 5: Consider survey timings to maximise participation</p> <p>Feedback indicates that students would rather receive early feedback on actions taken in response to their comments.</p> <p>Student participation in classes reduces later in the terms, so participation numbers can be low for some modules.</p>	<p>Consider adjusting the timing of surveys to maximise participation and enable early feedback to be collected and in-module actions taken where applicable (<i>e.g. to replace end of module with mid-module surveys or as an additional informal opportunity for feedback</i>)</p>	<p>Consult with staff/students on preferred timings of surveys and results, and prevent 'over-surveying'.</p>

Part 5.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
	<p>Recommendation 7: Consider measures to increase accessibility of surveys</p> <p>Feedback indicates that students with specific learning requirements find the paper-based surveys inaccessible.</p>	<p>Conducting surveys online increases accessibility.</p>	<p>See Recommendation 4.</p>

Part 6.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
<p>REPORTING</p>	<p>Action 4: Guidance and best practice to be shared relating to reporting and dissemination of results and actions</p> <p>Transparency is needed to provide clarity with regard to the use of module evaluation data for HR purposes.</p> <p>There are no formal mechanisms at present to recognise and share good practice noted from module evaluation or to monitor action plans; this could be embedded in School governance structures and routine frameworks.</p> <p>Dissemination of actions taken in response to surveys to students varies across programmes.</p>	<p>Staff appraisal and promotion processes to note which survey questions relate to whole modules and individuals respectively so that feedback can be used in context.</p> <p>Guidance to be developed relating to recognition of high scoring modules and reviewing feedback for positive comments to share best practice</p> <p>School Learning and Teaching Committees to oversee monitoring of action plans for low scoring modules and mechanisms for sharing good practice.</p> <p>Consult with SU regarding students' preferred methods for receiving feedback on actions taken as a result of module evaluation and develop guidance for Schools.</p> <p>APE policy, guidance and template to be reviewed to support consistency of reporting actions taken in response to student feedback.</p>	<p>The Module Evaluation Policy will set out how module evaluation data is used, and will signpost to relevant existing guidance notes.</p> <p>Guidance on good practice in reporting and dissemination outcomes to be shared.</p> <p>Senate and Schools to consider further reports that would be useful to provide oversight of module evaluation</p>

Part 6.	Proposal and Summary <i>(please refer to main report for full details)</i>	Recommendations	Proposed Further Actions
	<p>Recommendation 6: Consider additional reporting methods to enhance oversight to support monitoring of KPIs</p> <p>Noting timings of availability of data in relation to paper-based survey method, the sequence of reporting to relevant committees for educational oversight, and confidentiality requirements.</p>	<p>Review current reporting formats to evaluate where updates would be beneficial and whether these are feasible from a resource perspective.</p>	<p>Liaise with stakeholders and key committees to inform proposals</p>
	<p>Recommendation 8: Consider feasibility of additional reporting requirements in relation to equality and diversity</p> <p>In order to analyse possible bias in relation to gender or other characteristics, and reduce impact on decisions made in relation to academic staff, the nature and scope of analysis would need to be agreed.</p> <p>Module evaluation data would need to be linked with HR records and additional resource provided to undertake further research, the data production, analysis and reporting.</p>	<p>Establish the scope and requirements to ascertain whether these are feasible from a resource perspective.</p>	<p>Liaise with stakeholders and key committees to inform proposals</p>