What do Staff and Students really think about Course Evaluation (SCEF)?

Sandra Airio
Dr Colin Calder

6th December 2018
2018 NSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>23. I have had the right opportunities to provide feedback on my course</th>
<th>24. Staff value students’ views and opinions about the course</th>
<th>25. It is clear how students’ feedback on the course has been acted on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Aberdeen</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: nss.texunatech.com
2018 SCEF Review

The purpose of this internship is to support the SCEF review and the related work of the current Evidence for Enhancement Theme

• Analyse the extensive database of SCEF questions and responses held by IT services to determine response rates and utility of mandatory and optional questions, and determine how the system is used across the institution

• Evaluate student perceptions of course review in order to inform strategy to increase student and staff confidence in revisions to the student course evaluation procedures
Summer internship:

• Analyse historical SCEF data
• Qualitative research – What do Staff and Students really think about SCEF?
Centralised data on SCEF results is really hard to get!
What do **Students** think about SCEF?

 Mostly negative things, they don’t understand the value of the exercise

 *(The system is generic, run by people who have nothing to do with their courses)*

 *The value of SCEF responses is lost to students*

 *Assumptions that no one looks at the results or acts on them*

 *The scheduling of SCEFs is perceived to be negative*

 *Too many emails at a stressful time*

 *Students feel teaching staff have given up on SCEF)***
What do **Staff** think about SCEF?

Mostly negative things, they don’t understand the purpose of the exercise, and who it is for

(The purpose of SCEF is unclear
Agency: who is in charge and who is it for?
Pre-set questions are not effective
The low response rates are a concern
SCEF is in need of a restructuring)
Outcomes?

Positive things:

• Much better understanding of our own system
• Increasing awareness of other institutions’ systems
• An increasing body of evidence to inform how we enhance course evaluation
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the student experience

Enhancing annual monitoring and supporting programme leadership

Julie Blackwell Young; Abertay University
Context for change
What we did
What are our next steps?
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

Academic staff
Registry
Planning
Teaching & Learning Enhancement
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In Praise of the Forum: Sharing Best Practice to Enhance Retention and Attainment

Aliki Varvogli and Charlie Kleboe-Rogers, University of Dundee
The Forum at Dundee

- Themed meetings that take place a couple of times a year.
- Sharing best practice and problem-solving.

- Medium-sized group comprising
  - ADs or Deans from the 9 Schools
  - Professional services
  - Students (DUSA)
Retention and Progression Forum, September 2018

- Presentations showcasing best practice in engaging with data and other forms of evidence to support retention and progression.
- Discussion on how such work links with existing or developing policies.
- Case studies.
- Brainstorming.
Access and Participation Unit

Supported access at Dundee: Retention and progression figures for SIMD20.
Attendance monitoring working group

Presentation on current practice, challenges and opportunities.

Conclusion:
Staff should be able to concentrate on analysing and acting on data, not collecting and inputting.
School of Social Sciences

Work undertaken by AD and School Operations Manager.

Retention figures: analysis and discussion about the use and interpretation of data.
School of Life Sciences in association with the Academic Skills Centre

Retention and progression of College Articulation entrants.
Evidence to highlight best practice as well as challenges.
School of Medicine

Progression of Year 1 medical students.
Collaborative project with School of Education to support and aid progression.
Student Services

Power BI data dashboards demonstration and feedback.
Business School

Case study: using field-trips to build identity and sense of belonging in aid of retention.
Student Input

Using our Data sharing agreement- Student union will be using the retention and progression analysis to look at what students are “Slipping through the net”

Using these figures to style interventions and create campaigns around prevention of drop out - non descript campaign so it isn’t obvious.

Create a culture that is more open to talking about issues rather than shy away from them – sector wide-

Data Matters Survey is going ahead 2019!
Thank you
Community and Belonging at University
What matters? What counts?

Edinburgh Napier University
6th December 2018
#EdNapBelonging
Community and Belonging
The Evidence for Enhancement Challenge

A recurrent theme in student experience and success literature and influences much of our practice.

- Literature: Creating sense of belonging key to retention,
- Strength of learning communities influential in success.

What matters? And what can we count?

- NSS: Renewed focus on ‘belonging’
- Engaging with different voices and exploring specific contexts
- How ‘belonging’ plays out in different contexts, and what made a difference.

ENU activity and interest:

- Understanding what student value in a learning community and what aspects of ‘belonging’ matter.
- Exploring diversity - and creating environment that meets diverse student needs.
The Impact of the NSS......

- In 2017 NSS questionnaire updated, new ‘Learning Community’ and ‘Student Voice’ sections.

- Added questions on
  - I feel part of a community of staff and students
  - I have had the right opportunities to work with other students as part of my course
  - I have had the right opportunities to provide feedback on my course
  - Staff value students’ views and opinions about the course
  - It is clear how students’ feedback on the course has been acted on

- Contributed to an increased focus on community and belonging within Universities and among students.
## NSS – Quantitative Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSS Question</th>
<th>Overall UK Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel part of a community of staff and students</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had the right opportunities to work with other students as part of my course</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had the right opportunities to provide feedback on my course</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff value students’ views and opinions about the course</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear how students’ feedback on the course has been acted on</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Around a third of students do not feel as if they part of a community of staff and students.
- HEI’s have largely put in place good mechanisms allowing students to feedback – less clear to students how this feedback has been acted on.
Key aspects of ‘Community’

- Exploring verbatim comments to answers highlight that no shared sense of what ‘community’ means among students.

- **Shared Academic Experiences**

- **Relationship between Staff and Students**

- **Relationship between Students**

- **One Size Does Not Fit All**
Community and Belonging at University
Examples of Practice
#EdNapBelonging
Team Napier

- https://onlinevideo.napier.ac.uk/Player/13490
The Challenge of Belonging and Community

- Challenge of diversity: definitions, practice, measurement
- Diversity of practice - What matters? What makes a difference? To whom?
  - Students - Staff - Wider community connections
- If / how to create an institutional narrative of change?
  - What difference do we want to see?
  - How will we know we are moving in the right direction?
Next steps
What are we exploring and doing @ENU?

- Understanding existing evidence

- Creating spaces to share practice and challenges.
  
  Small amount of ET funding available for student-staff collaborative work to support learning community / belonging initiatives.

- What would an institutional narrative that encompasses diversity of interests and needs look like?
Discussion
Making data more accessible to students and staff

Nichola Kett – University of Edinburgh
Students
Providing Data to School Reps

- Pilot: to provide a standard high-level analysis of student feedback to School student reps
- Students’ Association + Academic Services + Student Systems and Administration
- Quantitative data
- Timing challenges
- School context is very important
- Evaluation underway
- Other related activities: enhancements in handover processes and new Students’ Association school reports
Supporting staff to make evidence-informed decisions

- Review of data and reports used for quality processes
- Benchmarking
- Sharing good practice – School Directors of Quality network
- Working with new Head of Student Data and Surveys on enhancements

Training and development – ideas:
- ‘How to’ data sessions
- Videos
- Case studies
- Teaching Matters blogs
Thank you
Promoting Student Engagement: GCU Student Experience Scholarships

Colin Milligan and Nicky Andrew
Glasgow Caledonian University
Improving the Student Experience at GCU

At GCU the current theme is wholly coherent with the strategic goals and priorities of the University, particularly the GCU Student Experience Action Plan (SEAP) with which it is aligned and integrated. The GCU SEAP has four main themes:

1. Student Engagement and a Sense of Belonging.
2. Programme Organisation and Management.
3. Assessment and Feedback.
4. Wider Student Experience.

This strategic focus centres on student achievement and success contextualised to the whole student journey from pre-entry to exit into employment or further study.
2020 Scholarship Scheme

- Aligned to University Priorities through the SEAP.
- Inquiry-Led (publish/present at conferences).
- Impact across the University not just within own practice.
- Team Scholarships drawn from across the University.
- Students as Partners.

- Aligned to QET.
Year One Projects

- Academic Advising/Personal Tutoring.
- Online Student Experience.
- Assessment & Rubrics.
Year One Projects Impact

- Revised Personal Tutoring system deployed.
- Reformed support for International Students.
- Abbreviated/Accelerated Thematic Review of Online Learning.
- Rubrics repository.
Year Two Reflection

Lessons learned from Round 1

• Timing: June-June funding gives insufficient time for outputs to feed into next Academic Year.
• External factors disrupt teams – effort on top of core role.
• Aligning/Integration with other enhancement activities is challenging.
Year Two Changes

Round 2

• Adjusted reporting timescales: report in April.
• Link to central staff for each project (where possible) to ensure close alignment to university priorities.
• Evaluation aligned to QET evaluation.
Year Two Projects

- Understanding Student Attendance.
- Student Partnership.
- Enhancing sense of belonging through co-creating inter-disciplinary projects.
- Exploring the challenges of teaching students from diverse backgrounds.
- Evidencing a better understanding of the learning of students with disabilities.

- Trans-non-binary and gender diverse staff and student experiences.
- Mental Health/wellbeing.
Thank you
Benefits of asset mapping to trigger metrics to qualitative data.

A Study space for group work

Rudy Kanhye

Glasgow School of Art
Aims and difficulties

A negotiation project
What is Asset Mapping?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual assets</th>
<th>Relational assets</th>
<th>Collective assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills, Knowledge, Leadership, Capacities, Experiences, Personalities, What we have What we can bring to the group.</td>
<td>Networks, relationships, partnerships, friendships, kindships, group ties, associations.</td>
<td>Stories: Traditions, cultures, institutions, norms, collective experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is different from this project?

Example of an Artist installation
WOUND at Cooper union University, NY.
Where are we just now?
The Glasgow School of Art

Making Evidence Work

Review of Annual Monitoring process (PMAR)

Amanda Park
Learning & Teaching Coordinator
Why are we doing it?
What’s the current process & How could it be enhanced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>PMAR captures</th>
<th>Information is recorded by</th>
<th>How can it be enhanced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide evidence based assurances</td>
<td>Comments on a range of evidence about student experience</td>
<td>Annual Programme Report (35 questions = 25 pages)</td>
<td>• Streamline questions to avoid duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help assess the quality of the learning experience</td>
<td>Evidence about successes</td>
<td>Quality Enhancement Action Plan (QEAP)</td>
<td>• Recognise maturity – evidence of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and manage risks</td>
<td>Reflection of key themes and associated plan of action</td>
<td>Critical Friend Pro Forma and Support Department Pro Forma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and share good practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual School Summary Report</td>
<td>• Appropriate School-level reporting + ‘exception reporting’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revision plans

• Conducted an investigation of practice
• Mapped the reporting requirements
• Consulted with staff and students
• Streamline the paperwork
• Produce Reflective Analysis Rubric
• Hold writing workshops with staff
• Annual Celebrating Practice Exhibition
• Evaluate the process
• Academic year 2019/20
Evidence for Enhancement: Theme
Leaders Group

Transforming Institutional Survey Processes at Heriot-Watt University
Dr Maggie King
Dr Ian Glen

6 December 2018
Heriot-Watt’s Key Learning and Teaching Surveys

**External Surveys**

- National Student Survey (NSS)
- Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey

**HWU’s own Surveys**

- Annual Survey
- Course Feedback Survey (CFS)

All institutional surveys (incl those not specifically related to learning and teaching) are overseen by the Student Survey Management Group
Institutional Process via University Committee for Learning and Teaching

- **Summary of Results + Key Issues** (September)
- **Action Plans to UCLT: Schools, Student Union, Professional Services** (November, March) *(specific discipline NSS Plans to University Executive)*
- **Institutional Summary of Issues + Actions** (November, March)
- **Annual Report on all L+T Surveys** (June)
HWU’s Survey Process

As good as it gets ....? Evidence for Enhancement ..?

• Institution-wide Process, but ...
  • no measures for evaluating the impact of institution-wide actions

• Comprehensive Action Plans, but ...
  • no requests for post-implementation evidence of impact of local actions

Job Done?

• Action Plans + Summaries = Process; Policies, Procedures, Guidelines = Outputs. **None is evidence of effectiveness of change**
How do we know if the actions we have taken have made a difference?
Learning and teaching

Student Surveys: Evidence for Enhancement?

Proposals and Recommendations for enhancing HWU’s Approach to Student Surveys, from UCLT Away Day, 17 January 2018 and UCLT meeting, 4 April 2018.

1. Review of Current Survey Processes
2. Use of Enhancement Theme Funding
3. Survey Enhancements (Engagement + Results)
4. Evidence of Effectiveness of Actions
5. Practices at Abertay – Implementing at HWU?
6. Surveys 2017: Priority Areas for Action
Enhancement Theme Project

Research Assistant: focused task to revitalise the Course Feedback Survey to close feedback loop

• Survey Week (12-19 November)
• Question vetting
• Extensive staff and student engagement
• In class completion
• Looking to the UK sector (and abroad)
• Empowered by academic leaders to make a difference
Learning and teaching Enhancement Theme Project

**Before Semester**
- Audit Surveys to remove overlap (15)
- Ensure schools specific questions are too a high standard (8)
- Create/update Together We Accomplished webpage (3)
- Guides for Lecturer endorsements written (10)

**Week 1**
(Starting 10/09/2018)
- Present selection of previous years’ feedback (1)

**Throughout**
- Carry out continuous feedback (5)

**Week 9**
- Students given guidance on responding with constructive and professional feedback (14)

**Week 10**
- Open Survey Monday morning (11)
- Pusher emails - Monday, Wednesday and Friday (12)
- In class completion at prearranged times (9)
- Lecturers present endorsements of the surveys including what they need to make Improvements

**Week 11**
- Final pusher email Monday morning (12)
- Close surveys Monday night (11)
- School Officers invited to take part in anonymization of student responses (16)

**Week 12**
- Reports sent to lecturers
- Teaching teams discuss common issues and responses
- Feedback loop closed through in class discussions
- Class Reps to disseminate information (4)

**Assessment Results**
- Send out summary of feedback and responses (2)
Response Rate

Sem 1 17/18: 10731 (21%)
Sem 2 17/19: 8977 (15%)
Sem 1 18/19: 11953 (24%) – range across Schools 15-33%
Now what?

- We have evidence (lots)
- We have two weeks that we didn’t previously have

- Time to respond…
Closing the Feedback Loop

• What does this actually mean?
• What is there to close if you’ve done well?
• How do you close when it’s gone poorly?
• Who do you close with?

• Are you listening to me? If you aren’t I won’t keep talking…
How are we closing feedback?

- Start AND end of semester
- Exam results
- Together we accomplished webpage
- Student Reps
- Linked with staff testimonials

- Report to University Committee for Learning & Teaching on themes, and crucially, what we can do to address these embedded issues.
Discussion/Questions

We are very keen to learn from you.

• Timing
• Techniques of closing feedback loop
• Building a culture of feedback being listened to
• And anything else…
Linking student representation to enhancement

Heather Fotheringham
Sorcha Kirker
Catriona Meighan
The Theme at UHI

Overall aims of this Enhancement Theme:
- To **identify** the range and sources of evidence required for effective quality assurance and enhancement
- To **generate** and **use** this evidence to highlight issues and plan associated interventions
- To **evaluate** the effectiveness of these interventions

- **Project 1:** Linking evidence to curriculum enhancement
- **Project 2:** Linking student representation to enhancement
- **Project 3:** Linking assessment feedback to student progression

**Sector strand 1:** Optimising the use of existing evidence
- To improve staff capacity to analyse, contextualise and act upon student feedback data

**Sector strand 2:** Student engagement
- To engage student reps as creators and users of evaluation and feedback data

**Sector strand 3:** Student demographics, retention and attainment
- To support student progression through innovative and effective use of assessment feedback
For each project

- Dedicated work with programme teams/student reps
- UHI-wide events
- Aligning internal initiatives with the Theme
LTA Scholarship research

Students as partners: Creating a collective responsibility for course evaluation and improvement
Catriona Meighan, Student Engagement Officer, Inverness College UHI
Evaluative processes at ICUHI

• How effective is our new approach
• How data is created/used and what the student role is
• To what extent are students and staff working collectively in the use of feedback and evaluative data?

• Background – Course Committee Meetings
• New approach
Changing landscape

- How Good Is Our College
- College Improvement Project

- Quality Improvement methodology
- Iterative change and learning
- Test of change

- Value in researching how effect approach is
Partnership thread

- Collective responsibility
- SE Framework link
- Tertiary approach
- Qualitative methodology
- Results prediction?
- Wider implications
Linking Student Representation to Enhancement and Belonging

Sorcha Kirker
Aims and objectives

Overall aim
• To engage student reps as creators and users of evaluation and feedback data

Specific aims
• Review and enhance the current student rep system
• Use student reps to raise awareness of student feedback mechanisms, including surveys, and to increase student engagement with these
• Improve staff understanding of the student rep role
• Increase engagement between academic staff and student reps
• Involve student reps in key data-led university processes (e.g. NSS action planning, student engagement action planning)
Main Objective

• To host a joint Student Rep Conference:
  • Participatory event – attendance from both Student Reps and Teaching Staff
  • Longitudinal output – post-conference activity to assess impact of the event
  • Develop the concept of a Student Rep community
  • Promote importance of the Student Rep systems & staff involvement
Potential Sessions

• Key Performance Indicators
• Student Surveys
• Student Reps 101
• Panel Discussion – Liberating education
• You Said We Did
• Analytics and Engagement Indicators
• Next steps?
Thank you
Data for student attainment: the Good, the Bad and the Ugly

Heather Gibson
Open University in Scotland
**Context**

Commissioner for Fair Access published discussion paper in December 2017 – Retention, Outcomes and Destinations

Comparing students from SIMD20 background to SIMD21-100

- Distribution of entrants,
- Retention: particularly for first year to second year
- Outcomes (degree classification)
- Destinations

For full-time students across HEIs in Scotland (excluding OU)
**Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience**

**Context…**

Commissioner for Fair Access published discussion paper in December 2017 – Retention, Outcomes and Destinations

**Findings -**
- **Distribution of entrants:** more students from SIMD20 students attend Post 92 Universities
- **Retention: first year to second year:** SIMD20 students ‘consistently lower’ around 5% across the sector
- **Outcomes (degree classification):** difference between SIMD20 students and rest obtaining a 2:1 is 15%. SIMD20 students much more likely to obtain unclassified degrees

**Destinations**

For full-time students across HEIs in Scotland *(excluding OU)*
Outcomes

Chart 9: Percentage of 2:1+ degrees, full-time first degree qualifiers, by SIMD, 2013/14 to 2015/16

Source: HESA student data
But what about OU (part-time) HE students?

Analysis of data suggests that:

At level 1 (SCQF 7) about 10% difference in completion rates between SIMD20 and SIMD21-100 students, including new (11%) and continuing students (9%)
At level 1 difference in pass rates (passing at first time) is around 9%

Looked at level 1 only because:
Sheer volume of data
New v continuing students phenomenon
Biggest transitional moment for students
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

**Project**

- **Data analysis**
  - Demographics of SIMD20 population “the intersections”
  - Extent of differences in attainment in assignment scores/submission rates

- **Literature review**
  - Potential reasons for attainment gaps

- **Qualitative data collection: tutor experiences of supporting SIMD 20 students**
  - Establish what research and practice has been carried out to reduce attainment gaps elsewhere
  - What difficulties do these students face and how do tutors support them?

**Investigate the attainment gap experienced by students from deprived backgrounds at level 1**
Data analysis: Demographics of SIMD20 population

Looked at:
  Previous educational qualifications
  Disability
  Gender
  Study intensity (particularly relevant for OU)
  Age
Data analysis: Demographics of SIMD20 population

Looked at:

Previous educational qualifications
  % of SIMD20 students who have NQ is *slightly higher* than the rest
  % with Highers is about the same
  % with a degree is about the same
Data analysis: Demographics of SIMD20 population

Looked at:
Disability

For continuing students the % of those with a disability in SIMD20 is about 10% higher than the rest.
For new students the % of those with a disability in SIMD20 is about 5% than the rest.
We need to test for statistical significance.
Data analysis: Demographics of SIMD20 population

Looked at:
- Gender
  - Gender ratio for both groups
    - Female to male is 60:40
- Age profile
  - Age profile is similar for both groups with a peak at 30-34 years
Data analysis: Digging deeper into performance

- Asked for assignment submission rates and scores for the largest level 1 courses
- Data is just in!
- There may be a difference between submission rates with rates lower for SIMD20 students but assignment scores look the same
- Much more digging and interrogation needs to be done!
Literature review - still in process

• Very little in the literature around attainment gaps and disadvantage
• More information around attainment gaps and BME/disability. Some lessons
  • Cultural issues
  • Not a homogeneous group
  • Ethical issues – do you tell students that they belong to a protected characteristics group?
  • Impact of work for students from disadvantaged backgrounds
  • ‘Hidden curricula’ – does the curriculum affect the perceptions of disadvantaged students
• Intersectionality!
Quick summary of tutor survey

- Tutors tend to identify students from SIMD20 backgrounds by information they tell them – no special tag
- Tutors offer more support in terms of:
  - More direct support
  - Extensions to assignments
  - Referred to other support in University
  - Additional study skills support
- Issues these students face:
  - Confidence
  - Lack of academic skills
  - Cultural capital
  - Chaotic lifestyles – more caring, more health issues etc
Reflections on using data

- The Good
  - Plenty of quantitative data
  - Discussing data with other colleagues and making connections
  - Formalising the anecdotal
- The Bad
  - Plenty of data!
  - Difficulties tracking down the right people to ask questions of
- The Ugly
  - Obtaining complicated data that stretches over several systems
Thank you
Creating Enhancement Energy

Professor Roni Bamber, QMU
Enhancement descriptors
(SHEEC, 2014)

1. Collaborative practice
2. Use of Enhancement Themes
3. Learning from international experience
4. Alignment and coherence
5. Evaluative practice
6. Students as partners
What is going ok?

1. Collaborative practice
   • Institutional team, wide-ranging, usually turns up!
   • Enthusiasm for sector-level work

2. Use of Enhancement Themes
   • Leverage of Enhancement Themes
   • Practical applications of this Theme

3. Alignment and coherence
   • With institutional initiatives + projects (Student dashboard, Staff dashboard, Retention & progression)
   • With policy (eg Outcome Agreement, WA)

4. Learning from international experience
   • Through collaborative clusters + sector work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Roni Bamber, Director, CAP</td>
<td>Chair, and TLG staff rep till Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Rowley, Head of Learning Services</td>
<td>Deputy Chair, and alternate TLG staff rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Ewing, Student rep, ASSAM (Psychology)</td>
<td>Chair, and TLG staff rep from Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Sally Anderson, Enhancement Theme Project Officer</td>
<td>Student rep (and TLG student rep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Bond, Assistant Lecturer, Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Institutional team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Craig, Head of Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christine de Placido, Senior Lecturer in Speech and Hearing Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Duffus, Careers Adviser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Gibson, Senior Lecturer, Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Glendinning, Student Retention and Surveys Manager, GQE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hood, Assistant Registrar (School Operations and Resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Hughes, Software Development Manager, Information &amp; Learning Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Johnson, Lecturer in Sociology, Academic Disabled Student Coordinator for the Division of Psychology &amp; Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Martin, Assistant Secretary, Governance and Quality Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Ross, Assistant Secretary, Registry and Academic Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Anthony Schrag, Lecturer in Creative Industries and Cultural Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Susanne Schulz, Lecturer in Psychology, Sociology and Education Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliyan Stefanov, Head of Student Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Warrack, Management Information Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is more challenging?

1. Students as partners
   - Engagement
   - Student-led?

2. Evaluative practice
   - Achieving meaningful enhancement outcomes (not just outputs)
   - Effort of evidencing value of Theme
   - Using evidence to generate more enhancement energy
Creating enhancement energy: Evidence for Programme Leaders

What needed?

- Not more **data**: better used
- [Five Things](#) project
Examples of programme level evidence

Evidence of student experience

Professional services: induction survey, library survey, IT survey, careers survey, SU survey, Admissions / Registry data

Student outcomes: Assessment grades, retention & progression rates, degree results, employability

Other stakeholders: staff, External Examiners, employers, placements, community…

Quality processes: annual monitoring, V&R, SSCC

Alignment with research, departmental / institutional policy, plans / portfolio review

Programme / module satisfaction: NSS, QSS, module evaluation

Feedback re University experiences of specific groups (international, direct entrants, etc)
Five Things Project – Evidence for PLs

1. Who are my students?
2. How do they engage?
3. How are they doing?
4. What do they find most useful?
5. How does this compare with other institutional and national information?

- Links to Learning Analytics cluster
- Links to PL cluster
Thank you
Driving enhancement activity in partnership with our students

Kirsty Campbell
Learning Analytics and Partnership Lead
Department for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Access (DELTA)

Neil Johnson
Academic Strategic Lead
School of Nursing and Midwifery

Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the student experience
“At its roots **partnership** is about investing students with the power to co-create, not just knowledge or learning, but the higher education institution itself”

*A Manifesto for Partnership, NUS (2015)*
Ethos of partnership

Listening to feedback
There are a wide range of formal and informal opportunities for students and staff to share feedback and engage in discussions about the learning experience at RGU.

Partnership in Action
Based on this feedback we develop shared priorities, working together to develop solutions and enhancements.

Achieved in Partnership
When enhancements are made – we aim to close the feedback loop and celebrate these achievements together.
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

The learner journey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Student Experience Questionnaire (SEQ)</td>
<td>Student Achievement Rates (SARs)</td>
<td>Destination of Leavers Survey (DLHE):</td>
<td>Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honours Classifications</td>
<td>HESA &amp; Professional Employment</td>
<td>PRSB accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptances</td>
<td>National Student Survey (NSS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fundability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integrated analysis

Quantitative and qualitative insights

Context: local, regional and national demographic and economic indicators

Core data shared with staff
Inc. indicators and contextual info

Informed conversations
At various levels eg SSLC, CMT, DELTA > Heads

Annual Appraisal Process
Bottom up. Benchmarks and comparisons

Analysis across data sets
Top down: NSS/SEQ/SA Rs DHLE/1st:21

Usage of evidence base

Bespoke project activity
Borderless GA Experience

Service design, delivery and appraisal
Usage Vs satisfaction

Enhancement priorities A&F

Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience
In support of achieving high quality feedback on students’ experiences, enhancements included:

- Delivery of a pilot in-year questionnaire
- Development of bespoke content to capture specific categories (e.g., Graduate Apprenticeships, PRES)
- Creation of a suite of promotional materials, informed by a DELTA Student Intern
- Extension of the School Survey Coordinator role
- Commissioning of appreciative enquiry into the ‘Student Voice’ and closing the feedback loop
- Dissemination of results via a new interactive reporting tool, RGU:Insight [Tableau]

Highest response rates to date
Additional 400 respondents
3000 additional comments
- Nursing is the single largest subject area within RGU's NSS target population.
- Over the previous five years the gap between the subject sector average and RGU performance had widened.
- Benchmarked against other Scottish institutions Nursing performed relatively poorly, ranked 9th of 10.
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

School approach

- Analysis
- Appraisal Action Plan – all staff
- Evidencing partnership
- Closing the loop
- Preparation for surveys
- Fieldwork
School activity

- Redefined roles: Academic Strategic Lead Student Experience and Stage Leaders
- Specific engagement with Student Voice project
- Development of communication strategy
  - School Bulletin - “The Pulse”
  - Active engagement with lead representatives
  - Focus on face to face communication with and between cohorts
  - Use of partnership branding to close the feedback loop at cohort level

Billy Ridler - https://youtu.be/iQxtEk_wlYw
Impact

- In comparison to the previous year, the School demonstrated a ten percentage point increase in satisfaction.
- At subject level RGU now ranks 6th / joint 5th [9th of 10 in 2017]
- Particularly notable improvements include:
  - ‘Feedback on my work has been timely’ increasing by twenty-one percentage points, to 86%
  - In addition all questions within the Academic Support category increased by over ten percentage points
- Student Voice category increased by 18%, to 71%

> Within our internal SEQ the School achieved the highest increase in UG results, and at 89% now considerably exceeds the RGU average [81%]
‘Visible impacts have been achieved within the School in terms of enhancements around aspects of course delivery, structure and consistency of student experience.

Through the development of strategies to promote student partnership, the culture within the School has shifted to one of stronger recognition of the roles of the teacher and learner and the School appears to have a stronger sense of community.

Openness and transparency have been enhanced as a result and students have a broader range of opportunities to influence change and the direction of travel in regard to future course development as well as taking ownership of student led initiatives’

Neil Johnston, Academic Strategic Lead: Student Experience & Enhancement
Further information:

Kirsty Campbell  
Learning Analytics and Partnership Lead  
DELTA  
E: k.campbell-a@rgu.ac.uk

Neil Johnson  
Academic Strategic Lead  
School of Nursing and Midwifery  
E: n.johnson@rgu.ac.uk
WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEACHER?
Evidence for Enhancement:
Improving the Student Experience

**Aim 1:** To develop a shared language of Learning and Teaching

**Aim 2:** To track and understand student changing perceptions of success

**Aim 3:** To generate engagement with the Theme across the institution

**Aim 4:** To evaluate the effectiveness of support mechanisms
Aim 1: To develop a shared language of Learning and Teaching

Aim 2: To track and understand student changing perceptions of success

Aim 3: To generate engagement with the Theme across the institution

Aim 4: To evaluate the effectiveness of support mechanisms
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

Project 1: Good Teacher/Good Learner

**WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEACHER?**

- Shareable LANGUAGE
  - Improve conversations around learning and teaching
    - Recruitment
    - Programme design
    - Programme delivery
    - Evaluation

Staff responses

Student responses
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience
WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEACHER?

TELL US WHAT YOU THINK

ARE YOU: A TEACHER  [ ]  A STUDENT  [ ]  OTHER  [ ]

portal.rcs.ac.uk/goodteacher
#GoodTeacher
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

RCS - Learning and Teaching Conference
Sept 2018

90-minute parallel session delivered 4 times to 130 academic and academic support staff
PG Learning and Teaching Programmes

60 minute session delivered to year 1 students

All 90+ students invited to fill in a postcard
RCS Café
Events
Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience

#GoodTeacher
What Makes A Good Teacher?

Welcome! We're glad you've found us. So what's all this about them?

We want to hear from you! Whether you're a student, teacher or involved in education some other way.

We're asking the question:

WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEACHER?
RCS Portal Space
RCS Portal Space

Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience
RCS Portal Space
Answers on a postcard...

**WHAT MAKES A GOOD TEACHER?**

**TELL US WHAT YOU THINK**

---

Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the Student Experience
Coming Soon…

WHAT MAKES A GOOD LEARNER?
Thank you
SRUC Progress
Case Study: Mid Module Evaluation

Karen Martyniuk

Evidence for Enhancement: Improving the student experience
Year 1 - Review of Progress

Three main projects undertaken;
1. Strengthen Annual Monitoring and Institution-led Review through improved use of evidence
2. Assessing digital technologies in curriculum delivery
3. Investigate current delivery of Modern Apprenticeships to inform development of Technical/Graduate Apprenticeships

Project proposals submitted into the round of Pedagogic Research Proposals to support theme
Year 2 – Where are we?

Significant emphasis on the digital side – 4 pedagogic research project proposals funded;

- Digitally and collaboratively enhance student experience within a digital classroom
- Development of electronic resources to aid student learning and understanding of the college farm environment
- Adopting mobile phones into HE learning environments – practicalities and implications for pedagogic practice
- Mid module evaluation – a case study
Case Study: Mid Module Evaluation
Mid Module Evaluation – Why?

Students told us they wanted to benefit from their feedback
Want to develop student satisfaction concept earlier due to poor NSS results
Want to improve the staff experience
Timing isn’t right for SRUC to move away from end of Unit/Module Survey

Culturally embedding the process

Gathering authentic student voice at the end of delivery on assessment feedback is important – NSS results
Mid Module Evaluation – How?

Selected Two degree programmes at one Campus
Two members of staff from each area were asked and willing to participate
Used the software PINGO – free and anonymous
Plan was to stimulate a discussion with the students
Questions asked;
Do you think the balance of delivery is: a. Too much theory and too little practical b. Too much practical and too little theory c. Just right
3. Does the subject seem relevant to your course y/n
4. Are you satisfied with the module y/n
Mid Module Evaluation – Early Results and Next stages

- Positive and constructive feedback from staff
- Some technical queries to address
- Opportunities to use the app more widely to enhance learning and teaching

Next stages
- Focus groups with students
- Review the question set
- Further develop the guidelines and widen the project group during semester 2
Thank you
Using evidence to improve the design of learning and teaching space

Margaret Adamson
Head of TEL & IT Skills Development
University of St Andrews
6 December 2018
too much!

not enough!
Some have evidence thrust upon them!
Q53. Teaching rooms are well designed for the technologies we use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>249 (46.6%)</td>
<td>208 (39%)</td>
<td>77 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St Andrews</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>RUK</th>
<th>All UK</th>
<th>Russell Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flexible furniture and informal learning spaces
Tell us about your experience!

**Are you**
- a student? ☐
- a member of staff? ☐

Which **room** does your response relate to?
- Room 218 (S/R 4) ☐
- Room 220 (S/R 5) ☐
- Room 222 (S/R 6) ☐

Which **module** are you studying? __________

Is this the first time you have taught/been taught in this room? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please rate this room compared to a standard teaching room (1=low, 5=high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decoration</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort of furniture</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility of furniture</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whiteboard provision</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology provision</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are a student, did this space facilitate interaction with the lecture/tutor and other students? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you are a member of staff, did this space facilitate students’ interaction with you and each other? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please give us your comments on the space and how you used it.

You can also email learningtechnology@st-andrews.ac.uk.
My first impressions were that the system was quite intuitive and easy to use and especially useful in terms of the whiteboard feature and eraser. The seats also made the students more focused towards me and the screen, and it is very good to have fewer seats in the room, as it appears to be fuller and more intimate.

Would be useful for there to be a lectern for the lecturers also the desks are too small for books and laptop. Light reflection makes it hard to see whiteboard.
observation
interview
analysis
What have we learned so far?

• We need a strategic, informed, resourced and iterative approach to room upgrading
• Understanding expectations helps us manage expectations
• The importance of experimentation and imagination to the process
Moving along the learning analytics roadmap: and sharing the driving with our students

Richard Aird, Head of Customer Service
University of Stirling
Learning Analytics Enhancement Theme Strand

Aims to:
• Review of the capabilities of our current systems to offer learning analytics
• Identify with academics and students the types of learning analytics which are helpful to them
• Provide analytics to staff and students in an accessible format and support them to use this

The benefit of this activity:
• To the institution will be enhanced engagement by students in their learning and the ability to target intervention and support more effectively
• To the sector will be to add to evidence base available and to share best practice, in this developing area
Learning Analytics Roadmap

Key milestones:
- Review existing systems to identify what capability currently exists in relation to learning analytics (April 2018)
- Pilot new approaches to learning analytics: Tableau/Canvas and Jisc LA trial (December 2018)
- Establish learning analytics steering group (February 2018)
- Stakeholder engagement exercise (July 2018)
- Horizon scanning & market appraisal (November 2018)
- Business case submitted to request investment (February 2019)
- Procurement exercise(s) (June 2019)
- Implementation(s) (August 2019 onwards)
## Learning Analytics Steering Group

### Academics:
- Dean for Teaching Quality
- Enhancement
- Senior Teaching Fellow
- Lecturer
- Early Career Fellow

### Professional Services:
- **Head of Customer Service (IS)**
- Head of Business Applications (IS)
- Infrastructure Specialist (IS)
- Head of Student Systems & Data (SACS)
- Head of Student Support (SACS)
- Learning & Teaching Support Manager (IS)
- Academic Development Partner (HR&OD)

### Student Union:
- VP Education (sabbatical officer)
- Democracy & Research Coordinator
Progress:

Steering group established, regular communication by way of email updates

Tableau/Canvas Trial proving useful

Staff consultation well underway, via Faculty L&T Committees (with student presence) or targeted events; specific meetings with professional services

Student consultation underway, led and delivered by Student Union – engaging faculty/course representatives across institution

Vendor visits/demos scheduled Nov/Dec 2018
Progress:

QAA-funded Collaborative Cluster
• Learning about different perspectives & business drivers
• Realising where we are on the curve
• Supporting the agenda across the cluster and sector

Student placements:
• Two internships hosted at UoS, filled by two PGT students
• Output: baseline analysis of Scottish sector
Barriers to Progress:

Industrial action – several milestones postponed

Jisc LA trial delayed – Canvas integration not available as early as had been announced

Initial consultation feedback is limited - chicken & egg situation

Opposing views in consultation feedback – e.g. students seeking automated (anonymous) prompts / calls for action, versus staff seeking exclusively human intervention
Students in the driving seat:

VP Education role at:
• Education & Student Experience Committee
• Digital Development Project Board
• Learning Analytics Steering Group (with Democracy & Research Coordinator)

Student consultation led & delivered by Student Union

Student representation at every vendor demo and procurement exercise – student voice critical in setting requirements & evaluating products
Students in the driving seat:

Next steps:

Co-design: learning analytics policy and/or ethical policy

“Student-led” ethical policy – proposing our core principles.

Liaison with academics & student support services to discuss & agree approach to interventions

Student learning & experience focused business case (linked to student retention)

Procurement exercise with student panel members
In summary...
Any questions?

Richard Aird, Head of Customer Service
richard.aird@stir.ac.uk
@ricaird
Thank you
Data Literacy
Support Programme Leaders at Strathclyde

Helyn Gould, Deputy Associate Principal
ET Activity at Strathclyde

3 Streams of activity:
• Learning Analytics
• Learner Experience Framework
• Data Literacy (New area)

Data Literacy stream led by Head of OSDU and involving:
• Organisational and Staff Development Unit (OSDU)
• Strategy and Policy
• Education Enhancement
• Deputy Associate Principal
Phase 1: Understanding the Data Landscape and Organisational Context

- Emphasis on data driven decision making at management level
- Extensive access to external and internal data sets – development of single location department data sets for enhancement
- No reliable information on programme level data use or development needs.

The Programme Leader (PL) Role at Strathclyde

- Different organisational structures around PL role – no unified role specification
- Role assigned locally – limited central oversight and direct contact
- Mainly reliant on effective handover from previous PL
Phase 1 objectives

What are the relevant data sets at Strathclyde that could be used by PLs for enhancement?

Survey/Audit of PLs to explore:
• What data are PLs aware of and using in their roles?
• What data are PLs not using and why is it not being used?
• How are PLs using data in their roles?
• How useful do PLs find the available data?

PGR Student Intern employed for project.
Qualtrics survey

57 fully completed responses received covering 24 out of 28 areas. Responses categorised by level of programme and mode of study.

Captured responsibilities in groupings:
- Management
- Teaching and Assessment
- Review and curriculum development
- Additional (incl recruitment and employer engagement)

Data sets split into groupings:
- Survey data (NSS, SUSS, ISB, PTE, PRES)
- Formal reporting data sets (HESA, HEIDI)
- Destinations (DLHE, LEO)
- Systems (KPIs, Applications, NSS sector results, GEMS)
## Usefulness of survey data sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NSS</th>
<th>UG PLS</th>
<th>SUSS</th>
<th>UG PLS</th>
<th>ISB</th>
<th>UG PLS</th>
<th>PTES</th>
<th>PGT</th>
<th>UG PLS</th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>UG PLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG PLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSS</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG PLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG PLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTES</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG PLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG PLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Extremely useful**
- **Very useful**
- **Moderately useful**
- **Slightly useful**
- **Not at all useful**
- **Not yet sure**
Results so far

• The results indicated that PLs have a good awareness and use of some key data sets.
• Other data sets and Strathclyde systems use low.
• Main reason for not using data sets are access issues and lack of perceived relevance to their PL role.
• Specific training gap identified in accessing and extracting data at the required level of granularity.

Phase 2 developments:
• Targeted support for new PLs.
• ‘Guide to Data at Strathclyde for PLs’
• Details of range of PL responsibilities.
Thank you
Enhancement Theme: Evidence for Enhancement

Jane MacKenzie
Head of UWS Academy
Successes and challenges

Successes:
1. Year 1 institutional work outcomes
2. Year 2 plans informed by year 1

Challenges:
1. Undertaking project work for year 2
2. Staff Development
3. Enabling enhancement
Year 1 institutional work

- Formation of an Theme working group
- Project work
  - Student-led project
  - Staff-focused project
Year 1 institutional work: Programme Leaders project

- PhD student acted as RA (UWS Academy)
- Interviews with Programme Leaders (PLs)
- PLs use range of evidence to enhance their programmes including: MEQs, SSLGs, NSS, chats with students
- Not all PLs use all data available, some more strategic than others

Changes PLs do make are **minor, structural ones** rather than broader enhancements
Year 1 institutional work: Student-led project

• Run out of SAUWS – 3 UG interns
• Survey and focus groups of students (mainly) and staff
• Key themes include:
  o MEQs seen as a ‘tickbox exercise,’ too late to impact current students, and students saw little evidence of change in response to them
  o Lack of transparency in the student rep system
Success: Year 1 institutional work

• Despite the tight timelines of Year 1, the Enhancement Theme group were pleased by outcome of project work
• Project work along with ET group discussion led to the identification of 2\textsuperscript{nd} year areas of focus:
  – Mid-module evaluations and their alternatives
  – Student representation
  – The use of technology to democratise quality enhancement
Successes and challenges

Successes:
1. Year 1 institutional work outcomes
2. Year 2 plans informed by year 1

Challenges:
1. Undertaking project work for year 2
2. Staff Development
3. Enabling enhancement
Challenge 1: Year 2 work

Sent an invitation to all staff to tender for up to £2000 for each area

• Received tender for one project of £3000
• No tender for other 2 projects

Currently negotiating with SAUWS and a small number of UWS staff to undertake these projects
funding opportunities

Enhancement Theme Institutional work fund (ETI)

Call for tenders for 3 projects
- Exploring the use of mid-module evaluations
- Student representation
- Using technology to democratise quality enhancement

Learning and Teaching Enhancement Fund (LTEF)

Call for bids
< £1500
Any aspect of L+T (but further guidance about themes is available)

Email UWSAcademy@uws.ac.uk for further details
Challenge 2: staff development

• UWS uses a range of processes to explore student experience and the quality of L+T: MEQs, SSLCs, NSS, ILRs, AMRs etc etc.

• Also provides staff with a broad range of detailed data sources including UWS dashboard
AccessPoint

Category: All
Attribute: No Attributes Available
View as: 

Graduate Destinations
Last Updated: 2018-09-03 06:54
view details

HESA PIs
Last Updated: 2017-03-31 12:01
view details

Corporate KPIs
Main landing page qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-02 05:00
view details

Module Results & MEQ Survey Results
Module Results and MEQ Survey Results.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-04 00:02
view details

Programme Performance.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-04 06:31
view details

Programme review 2017_V11test_May 18.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-10-01 06:32
view details

Research and Enterprise.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-03 07:00
view details

Room Usage.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-04 09:00
view details

Staff Profile
Last Updated: 2018-10-25 16:43
view details

Student Population
Last Updated: 2018-12-04 11:50
view details

Student Profile
Last Updated: 2018-12-04 03:47
view details

Survey Results.qvw
Last Updated: 2018-12-01 06:15
view details

UWS Dashboard
Challenge 2: staff development

• UWS uses a range of processes to explore student experience and the quality of L+T: MEQs, SSLCs, NSS, ILRs, AMRs etc etc.

• Also provides staff with a broad range of detailed data sources including UWS dashboard

• However, staff do not/are not using the full range of data
Challenge 3: enabling action

• PLs do make are *minor, structural changes* in response to evidence
• Less likely to make more sweeping changes
• Some of our QA processes may be inhibiting innovation and change
Questions?