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TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE
ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY CIRCULAR

As advised by email on 30 August 2013 the meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee scheduled for Thursday, 5th September 2013 has been cancelled. A number of items are in progress, but are not at a stage for consideration by the Committee, a meeting is therefore not warranted.

Attached are items for information and consideration by circular. If you do not agree with the recommendation from the Chair in Part 2 or would prefer that the item be referred to the next meeting for discussion, please contact me no later than Monday, 9th September 2013. If there are no objections by that date the item in Part 2 will be processed in the normal way and the recommendation will be recorded as a resolution of the Teaching and Learning Committee in the next set of minutes.

Ms Sue Smurthwaite
Associate Director,
Academic Policy Services
TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE AGENDA BY CIRCULAR

PART 1 – ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC

1. TEACHING AND LEARNING DEVELOPMENT FUND – INTERIM REPORTS – REF F43212
The 2012 Teaching and Learning Development Fund Scheme had required the provision of a brief interim report outlining each project’s progress to date. All reports have now been received and referred to the Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) network for consideration and discussion at its 30th August meeting. These interim reports are also available on the Teaching and Learning Committees TLDF web site.

For noting.

2. NATIONAL OFFICE FOR LEARNING AND TEACHING (OLT) CITATIONS FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS TO STUDENT LEARNING – REF F27382
The Chair is pleased to announce that the following colleagues have been awarded national Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning:

Dr Lisa Cluett (Student Support Services, Registrar’s Office) – for a sustained and innovative influence on student learning and engagement through the development of leadership networks and online communities.

Associate Professor Peter Hammond (School of Physics) – for sustained, inspirational and enthusiastic teaching illuminating the real world relevance of quantum physics concepts and inculcating a love of science across all year levels.

Members are asked to join with the Chair in extending congratulations to Dr Cluett and Associate Professor Hammond.

PART 2 – ITEM FOR CONSIDERATION AND DECISION BY CIRCULAR

3. DISTRIBUTION OF SURF EVALUATION DATA AT UWA – REF F14217
At its meeting held on 6th June 2013, the Teaching and Learning Committee considered a brief paper outlining the background to SURF, its current levels of dissemination, comparisons with other universities and a proposal to make SURF results more widely available to UWA staff and students.

At that meeting, members strongly supported the proposal to disseminate SURF data more broadly, and further agreed that the principles should be reworked in light of discussion and reconsidered by the Teaching and Learning Committee in due course.

Attached (Attachment A) for members’ consideration is an updated report (v0.3) incorporating amended principles. In addition, this report has been considered and endorsed by the Vice-Chancellor’s Senior Leadership Group and input sought from the Academic Consultative Committee.

The report is before the Committee for its endorsement and referral to the Academic Council. Prior to consideration by the Academic Council, a draft policy encapsulating these principles will be formulated by Academic Policy Services to accompany the proposal.

For members’ information, the proposal to also include a comments component in SURF has been held over by the Chair, pending consideration and approval of this report and formulation of an appropriate policy.

The Chair recommends that the Teaching and Learning Committee endorse the paper ‘Distribution of SURF Evaluation Data at UWA’ (v0.3) as attached to the Agenda and refer this paper together with a draft policy encapsulating these principles to the Academic Council for its consideration and approval.

4. NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee will be held on Thursday, 3rd October 2013 at 2.00pm in the Senate Room. The cut-off date for submission of items for the Committee’s agenda is Thursday, 19th September 2013. Please refer issues for discussion to the Executive Officer, Ms Sue Smurthwaite (sue.smurthwaite@uwa.edu.au).
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Distribution of SURF Evaluation data at UWA

Background
UWA students evaluate their units via the SURF (Student Unit Reflective Survey) every semester. In a typical year, students submit over fifty thousand evaluations of approximately fifteen hundred units, with a response rate between fifty and sixty percent. SURF commenced in 2004 and since 2007 has been administered entirely online.

The SURF survey was designed to be administered towards the end of a unit. Questions relate only to the unit and do not seek feedback on an individual’s teaching. The six-item questionnaire asks students to express disagreement/agreement on a four point scale with the following statements.

1. It was clear what I was expected to learn in this unit.
2. The assessment requirements were clearly stated.
3. The assessment tasks were closely linked to the unit objectives.
4. The unit was well organized.
5. The learning resources (handouts, text, web resources, etc) were adequate for my study in the unit.
6. Overall, this unit was a good educational experience.

SURF responses are summarized in terms of SURF scores, calculated by quantifying the students’ responses Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree as 1, 2, 3 and 4 and averaging. The average SURF score across all units evaluated with SURF is about 3.1. Units well above average (more than 3.4) are regarded as excellent and units well below average (less than 2.8) are regarded as unsatisfactory.

SURF results are stored on a secure database at www.surf.uwa.edu.au. SURF survey results are currently released to different staff within the university in the following table. These levels of reporting were last confirmed as appropriate by the Teaching and Learning Committee in October 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Level of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit coordinators</td>
<td>Results for their own units, aggregated results for their school and faculty and the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School</td>
<td>Results for all units in their school; aggregated results for schools, faculties and the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Faculty, Faculty T&amp;L Representative</td>
<td>Results for all units in their faculty; aggregated results for schools, faculties and the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chancellor; Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor; Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education); Dean of Coursework Studies; Director of CATL.</td>
<td>Results for all units; aggregated results for schools, faculties and the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University public website</td>
<td>Aggregated results for each field of study and the University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every year in February, UWA’s Institutional Research Unit produces a report based on an analysis of the SURF survey results for the previous five years. The report is distributed to the Vice-Chancellor, Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), Deans, Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning), the Director of the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), and members of the University Teaching and Learning Committee. The report includes:
• University and faculty scores on each SURF item for each of the last 5 years
• SURF scores by unit level (Level 1, 2, 3 and 4+) for each of the last 5 years
• Distribution of SURF scores based on item 6 in the most recent year
• Number and percentage of excellent units by faculty on all items
• Number and percentage of excellent units by school based on item 6
• Number and percentage of excellent units by unit size and unit level
• Number and percentage of unsatisfactory units by faculty on all items
• Number and percentage of unsatisfactory units by school based on item 6
• Number and percentage of unsatisfactory units by unit size and unit level

All full copy of the 2012 SURF report, distributed by IRU as noted above on 4 March 2013, is available upon request to the IRU.

Principles

UWA teaching staff are encouraged to provide a summary of the previous semester’s SURF results to each new cohort of students and explain how the unit has been modified in response; however, in reality this rarely occurs. As a consequence, while UWA students provide the data for the SURF survey, they usually are not provided with any feedback or results. This issue has been brought to the attention of the UWA executive by the Student Guild. The UWA Teaching and Learning Committee has been asked to consider to making SURF results more widely available to UWA staff and students and to develop a proposal for Academic Council with regard to how to move towards this goal. The following principles have been developed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) for consideration by the Teaching and Learning committee to guide this process.

i. The University relies heavily on Student Unit Reflective Feedback (SURF) surveys as a reliable source of information on the quality of teaching and learning experiences within units.

ii. Given that students are asked to provide evaluative survey feedback via SURF in respect of every unit in which they enrol, it would seem reasonable and respectful for the University to report back to students on the results of those surveys, and any consequential actions taken. This is consistent with the University’s view of students as ‘responsible co-developers’ of their educational experiences.

iii. The reliability of SURF survey data is crucially dependent on a good response rate, and response rates have been falling in recent years. Providing students with the results of unit evaluation surveys will encourage them to participate more actively and responsibly in the evaluation of units.

iv. Information on unit ‘quality’ is now widely shared between students on social media, in alternative handbooks, and by ‘word of mouth’, and used in making unit selections. Making SURF survey results broadly available to students will increase the likelihood that their unit selection decisions are based on reliable sources of data.

v. Any unit evaluation information that is provided to students should also be made available to all academic staff. Most units are delivered interdependently with others within teaching programs (sequences, majors, courses), sometimes spanning Schools and Faculties, and making unit evaluation information more broadly available encourages academic staff to work together to identify ways to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the programs with which they are associated.

vi. The most meaningful level at which SURF results should be reported to students and staff stakeholders is at the individual unit level. Aggregating over Schools, or Faculties, or Fields of Education generally reduces the utility of the data.

On the following pages information from other universities about the degree of release of information about student evaluations of units is provided.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Aggregated data</th>
<th>Unit level data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Student Evaluation of Teaching of Units (SETU)</td>
<td>• Summary reports are prepared after each semester and published on the University website (no login required)</td>
<td>• Unit evaluation static reports are published on the Office of Planning and Quality website with public access (no login required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Curtin University           | eVALUate online system for gathering and reporting students’ perceptions of their learning experiences | • The University Aggregated Report is available to all staff and students (login required). Includes University and Faculty response rate, quantitative results and themes in qualitative results.  
• Aggregated Course Report (ACR) includes aggregated percentage agreement with quantitative items 1-7 & 11 for each course                                                                                   | • Unit Summary Reports (USR) are available for all staff and students when published by the Unit Coordinator.                                                                                                                   
• A USR includes percentage agreement with the quantitative items and the Unit Coordinator’s response (optional)                                                                                                       |
| University of Sydney        | Unit of Study Evaluation (USE). Every unit of study is evaluated at least once every three years. | • Aggregated data is used for annual Faculty reviews conducted by the Academic Board.                                                                                                                                 | • A summary of the results of the most recent student evaluation must be displayed on the unit of study website or in handouts. The summary must refer to actions taken in response to the student comments.                                                                                               
• From 2013, all students whose units of study have been surveyed are being given access to the quantitative report for their unit of study. Unit coordinators also have an option to provide a written response with the report. |
| University of Queensland    | SECat (Student evaluation of Course and Teacher) student survey | • Composite reports are made available to UQ staff (www.tedi.uq.edu.au) (login required)                                                                                                                                 | • Course coordinators are required to provide students with feedback on the evaluation process and a brief summary as to how they have responded to previous course evaluations on the unit website. |

Degree of Distribution of Student Unit Evaluation Data by Other Universities
Monash University
Monash Aggregated data (Summary Reports) are available at:

Monash uses a Traffic Light System: Unit offerings are classified into one of four groups using the following median score cut-offs:

- Outstanding: ≥4.70
- Meeting aspirations: 3.60 – 4.69
- Needing improvement: 3.01 – 3.59
- Needing critical attention: ≤3.00

The traffic light system is a good display of information from the University’s perspective because the proportion of units meeting aspirations is very high. Graphs in the aggregated summary reports from Monash also show that over time the proportion of units needing critical attention is falling. An example graph from the Monash aggregated data using the traffic light system is presented over the page.

Monash Unit Evaluation reports including all items from their survey on every unit for every semester are available publicly on the Monash Website (http://emuapps.monash.edu.au/unitevaluations/index.jsp). An example is provided below.

5. Overall I was satisfied with the quality of this unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Scale</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median: 3.78
Mean: 3.66
Figure 1: Proportion of unit offerings falling into each 'traffic light category' by faculty, semester 2 2012
Curtin University
Below is a Sample Unit Summary Report (USR) published by the Unit Coordinator on the Curtin University website for staff and students (with a login). The Unit Coordinator’s response is optional.

### eVALUate Unit Summary Report
**Evaluation period: 2008 Semester 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Name: Animal Science 100</th>
<th>Responses: 385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Number: 00001</td>
<td>Enrolment: 1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Rate: 36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### eVALUate quantitative items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percentage Agreement</th>
<th>Percentage Disagreement</th>
<th>Percentage Unable to Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The learning outcomes in this unit are clearly identified.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The learning experiences in this unit help me to achieve the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The learning resources in this unit help me to achieve the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The assessment tasks in this unit evaluate my achievement of the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback on my work in this unit helps me to achieve the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The workload in this unit is appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The quality of teaching in this unit helps me to achieve the learning outcomes.</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am motivated to achieve the learning outcomes in this unit.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I make best use of the learning experiences in this unit.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I think about how I can learn more effectively in this unit.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall, I am satisfied with this unit.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit coordinator’s response: (maximum of 2000 characters)**

Dear students, many thanks for your encouraging feedback. I really appreciate that so many of you (from different locations) took the time out to provide valuable feedback on the unit. Overall, students were very positive in their feedback. Issues with learning resources have been identified and will be addressed through the purchase of new library resources for next semester which will be available online to all locations via Blackboard and the library.

Students were dissatisfied with the time of the class at the Bentley campus. Timetabling is not controlled by schools however this feedback has been given to the Head of School. The suggested improvements in terms of standardising the tutorial activities across all locations and amending the marking guidelines and assessment response sheets to provide more clarity on what is expected from students have been built into the unit for the coming semesters. Best wishes for the future.
EXAMPLE FROM THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

History Department Response to Student Feedback
HSTY1044 - Twentieth Century Politics and Culture (2008)
Unit Coordinator: Associate Professor Judith Keene

In the course evaluation, 122 students completed the evaluation out of the 371 students who were enrolled. Of these, 73% found the course satisfying and felt that the outcomes had been what they expected. 70% further agreed that the course encouraged their thinking.

The individual comments were largely favourable and constructive in their response to the course; tutors were commended for their efforts in tutorial groups to manage effective and stimulating discussions. Emma Dornits, Sandra Kostner, Margaret Poulos and Emma Bonham were all mentioned individually and overall the students were very happy with the quality of teaching.

Students enjoyed Judith Keene’s lectures. There were several requests that the lecture overheads should be put on Web CT BEFORE the lecture. Some students enjoyed the two lectures in close proximity while others found the scheduling a stretch of the concentration and indicated that they preferred lectures on separate days of the week.

Judith Keene’s reply: it is always hard to please everyone in a very large course. A propos of lecture outlines before the lecture, part of the task as a serious student in a first year course is to learn to listen and make effective lecture notes. To be given them before the lecture would preclude student developing this skill. The best strategy, in my opinion, is to make noted during the lecture and then check them later on the outlines of web ct to see what you may have missed. In relation to the scheduling, the need to have a large lectures theatre has a strong influence on when the lectures are scheduled. It is also necessary to have time slots in proximity in order to screen a movie.

A handful of students complained about the variety of topics covered. Some enjoyed the new areas cultural history; others who had been only exposed previously to traditional political history found it unusual to be reading about private life and dead bodies. Two students queried the study of the very small picture in the Italian fascism tutorial and several queried the role of gender as a category of historical analysis. There was mention also of the perennial problem which is that some students worry that they have not enough prior knowledge of the twentieth century.

Judith Keene’s reply: The purpose of the course is to introduce students to new ideas and new approaches within the historical discipline. This includes political history as well as cultural history, social history and the history of private life. Women and children make up a significant part of the population and deserve attention along with men and other players in the public arena.

Most students enjoyed the essay questions and found the assessment tasks allowed them to demonstrate what they had learned through the course. 62% of students agreed that they engaged with and were stimulated by the learning activities involved.

With the large number of students enrolled in this course and the increasingly larger numbers in tutorials, the teachers in the class were heartened that most of the comments were favourable. And there was noting but praise for the attentiveness and level of care shown by class teachers as recorded in their availability and readiness to assist students when the latter needed help or information.
University of Queensland
Unit coordinators at UQ are required to summarise student feedback and their actions as a result of the feedback on the unit website. An example is provided below.

Feedback Example

Through the ECP:

Dear students,

Thanks to feedback received from the previous cohort about their experiences of the course last semester. I really appreciate that so many of them took the time out to provide valuable feedback.

Overall, students were very positive. Issues with the organisation assessment tasks were identified by some as being problematic. Reviewing the time set for assignments in this semester with other core courses will hopefully address this.

As usual, a number commented in open response feedback that they didn’t like the 8:00 am lecture slot. Unfortunately, as timetabling is not controlled by Schools, this lecture time will be in place for this semester. This feedback has been given to the Head of School for future consideration.

Best wishes for this course and I look forward to receiving your feedback at the end of this semester.

Reference

Abstract
There has been considerable debate as to whether course evaluations are valid measures of teaching quality, or whether students instead reward tutors who give them high grades and assign low levels of work. To assess the factors that influence course evaluations, we measured university students' achievement goals and expectations at the beginning of the semester and also obtained information on grades and workload. Although grades and course difficulty did have a small influence on end-of-semester course ratings, structural modelling revealed that ratings were largely determined by how much students enjoyed or felt stimulated by the course content, which in turn depended on the perceived quality of teaching. Students with a mastery goal were more likely to look forward to the course, and this also contributed to positive course evaluations, but the effect was small. Overall, the results suggested that by far the largest determinant of student evaluation of courses is the quality of the teaching.