

## ACADEMIC POLICY SERVICES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY DECEMBER 2015 - RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

**TRIM FILE REFERENCE: F37868**

**FILE PATH ON SERVER:** S:\CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT\CURRICULUM  
MANAGEMENT\DOCUMENTATION AND REPORTS\CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY\2015-12 DECEMBER

### DOCUMENT STATUS

Draft       Ready for Review       Final

### DOCUMENT MODIFICATION HISTORY

Version Number	Primary Author(s) (name and position)	Description of Version	Date Completed	Provided To
0.1	Kath Williams	First draft – for comment and feedback	29 <sup>th</sup> February 2016	Ms Jan Cardy Manager, Curriculum Management
0.2	Kath Williams and Jan Cardy	Second draft - incorporating feedback received	3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2016	Ms Sue Smurthwaite, Director, Academic Policy Services
1.0	Kath Williams and Jan Cardy	Final version – incorporating feedback received – for approval	9 <sup>th</sup> March 2016	Ms Sue Smurthwaite, Director Academic Policy Services

### DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Approved By (name/position of approver)	Date
Sue Smurthwaite, Director Academic Policy Services	24 <sup>th</sup> March 2016

## BACKGROUND

A key goal for Academic Policy Services (APS) is to increase customer satisfaction across the University in relation to curriculum management. In March 2015 a selected group of 160 stakeholders were asked, in an on-line survey, to evaluate the services provided during 2014 and therefore establish, as a benchmark, the current level of customer satisfaction. In addition stakeholders were invited to suggest areas for improvement.

As a result the level of customer satisfaction (based on services provided during 2014) was benchmarked at **80.6%**.

The following table provides a summary of recommendations made as a result of the survey along with an update of progress made:

Recommendations	Current Status
Develop service level agreements (SLAs) for each stakeholder group.	In progress
Complete the implementation of Service Desk as an incident and change management change tool.	Completed
Demonstrate the commitment to improve customer service and communication by actioning suggestions for improvement (if relevant) and communicate the actions taken - 'you asked, we did'.	Ongoing – stakeholders updates provided by a mix of channels (email and presentations) <b>Attachment A</b> provides an update
Continue to seek opportunities to raise awareness of CAIDi, its role in the curriculum management process and communicate broadly with University staff (including rural areas) responsible for developing and managing curriculum and other relevant stakeholders.	Ongoing – Annual presentations (including Albany via remote access), CAIDi advice sheets, Web presence
Conduct the next survey in October 2015, and annually in October thereafter, to monitor and measure progress.	Conducted annually - second survey undertaken in Dec 2015

## 2015 SURVEY

A second survey was conducted in December 2015 and a total of 167 stakeholders were asked to evaluate the services provided, in relation to curriculum management, during 2015. The attached report (**Attachment B**), prepared by the Office of Strategy, Planning and Performance, presents the results of the second survey. The purpose of this report is to present an analysis of the results and identify new opportunities to improve the level of customer satisfaction.

The table below provides a comparison of the outcomes for both surveys:

<b>Overall level of customer satisfaction</b>	2014 survey: <b>80.6%</b>	2015 survey: <b>80%</b>
Customer satisfaction in the area of services provided	Average for 2014: <b>88.33%</b>	Average for 2015: <b>86.5%</b>
	Number of respondents: 48 (160 invitees) Response rate: 30%	Number of respondents: 48 (167 invitees) Response rate: 29%

Some key messages have emerged from the recent survey:

- While recognising that the survey outcomes have dropped slightly, the survey confirmed that the overall level of customer satisfaction continues to be high
- The survey has shown a marked increase in user awareness of CAIDi with an outcome of 71% compared with 52% in the first survey. This clearly confirmed that an outcome from the first survey 'to raise awareness of CAIDi and its role in the curriculum management process' had been successfully achieved
- Communication continues to be a strength within the curriculum management team
- Further work is required at the Faculty level to ensure their local curriculum management processes are well understood by relevant faculty staff

## SERVICES PROVIDED

Client satisfaction in relation to specific curriculum management services continues to be high and has improved in some areas as demonstrated below:

<b>Service</b>	<b>2014:</b>	<b>2015:</b>
Technical support (including help desk and advisory service)	90%	93.5%
Web-based CAIDi advice sheets	86.3%	88.9%
Self-reporting for Curriculum data	83.4%	88.0%

*'Self-reporting tools allow easy access to information that would usually have to be gathered manually or not existent at all.'*

*'Self-reporting is something I use very frequently across a variety of tasks.'*

It has also been recognised that some services have shown to have had a decrease in the level of customer satisfaction experienced as follows:

<b>Service</b>	<b>2014:</b>	<b>2015:</b>
On-line proposal forms	92.9%	83.3%
On-line change forms	83.9%	80%
On-line access to curriculum data	93.5%	85.3%

However the survey does not provided enough detail to establish the exact nature of the decrease in client satisfaction for the services listed above. All stakeholders will be encouraged to provide additional information regarding any concerns related to services provided and will be reminded that they can seek help and further information by contacting the CAIDi service desk [help-curriculum-aps@uwa.edu.au](mailto:help-curriculum-aps@uwa.edu.au).

## COMMUNICATION

The survey has confirmed that communication is an area of strength within the curriculum management team. It continues to be provided at a high level and has improved in the following areas:

Service	2014:	2015:
Quality of information and advice received from Academic Policy Services	78.6%	79%
Appropriate action was taken in response to feedback provided	70%	78.6%
Response time when making an enquiry	84.6%	90%

*'APS are always very professional, efficient and helpful.'*

Some comments received had indicated that communication regarding faculty curriculum management local process and local timelines could be stronger.

*'It is not clear when changes for the New Year are to be made.'*

*'If I want to share my intellectual excitement with students about discoveries I am making, I can't because 10-12 months previously the system locked me into teaching something else.'*

Further work is required at the Faculty level to ensure their local curriculum management processes are well understood by relevant faculty staff. This was a topic for discussion at the Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group meeting that was held in March where members shared ideas and strategies to assist faculties to strengthen communications related to curriculum management within each faculty.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Respondents were invited to provide suggestions for change/improvement and a summary of those received are available at **Attachment C** along with a proposed action plan.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of the data and specific feedback provided, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Formulate an exemplar of a service partnership agreement (SPAs) for Faculty / Colleges pending the outcomes of the Renewal project and the establishment of Service Delivery Centres. The benefits would include:

- Management of stakeholder expectations of the level of service provided
  - Clear definition of services provided by the APS team including response times
  - Agreement of stakeholder responsibilities e.g. quality of submissions
  - Alignment of service with available resources to ensure sustainable service
- Continue to demonstrate the commitment to improve customer service and communication by actioning suggestions for improvement (if relevant) and communicate the actions taken - 'you asked, we did'.
  - Continue to seek opportunities to raise awareness of CAIDi, its role in the curriculum management process and communicate broadly with University staff (including rural areas) responsible for developing and managing curriculum and other relevant stakeholders
  - Encourage faculty colleagues to strengthen their communication strategy to ensure local curriculum management processes and timelines are understood
  - Conduct the customer satisfaction survey annually in October to monitor and measure progress

## NEXT STEPS

Action	Timeline
Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group - discussion opportunity on feedback provided in the survey in relation to communication at the faculty level	2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2016
Final report to the Director, Academic Policy Services for approval	9 <sup>th</sup> March 2016
Approved report to the Dean of Coursework Studies	24 <sup>th</sup> March 2016
Publish report on UWA Curriculum Management webpages	March 2016
Feedback to survey respondents	March 2016
Agenda item - Associate Deans (Education) Network- discussion on the issues around communication	27 <sup>th</sup> May 2016

## ACADEMIC POLICY SERVICES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY – 2014 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

### ‘You Asked – We Did’

Suggestion for improvement - 2014 Survey	Action taken
Justification/rationale required for proposed changes on the on-line change forms are sometimes unnecessary/repetitive	Completed – 31% of fields no longer require rationales for change
Notify stakeholders when new features/changes in CAIDi are introduced	Completed – an email template has been developed and implemented to communicate changes and new features in CAIDi. Some faculties have utilised this templated information and circulated within faculties promoting better communication
Provide clearer definition of intake periods (broad) and intake periods (specific teaching periods) on postgraduate course form. These two fields are often inconsistent with one another.	Completed- Information on the form has been reviewed and expanded on.
Provide the ability to view a unit’s availability without having to generate a report	Completed – function is available via sequence tab and in the unit summary
Provide the ability to perform September updates for units in bulk	This was completed for the 2015 September updates
‘Watch’ function does not always send emails according to all users expectations	No action required – manage user expectations.
Clarify the data flow from CAIDi into other systems and websites	Ongoing- Information where data is shared is currently already available in CAIDi. This can be resolved by better education/communication with users.
Provide more data download spreadsheets (self-serve reports)	Ongoing- Reports already available in CAIDi and this can be resolved by better education/communication with users.
When submitting changes there is no confirmation coming up on what happens next	Completed – user receives a notification on successful submission
Course change report for faculty/school users should show changes in track changes instead of current and proposed side-by-side	Completed – report is currently available

## Academic Policy Services Customer Satisfaction Survey 2015

Survey period: December, 2015

Number of invitees: 167

Number of respondents: 48

Response rate: 29%

### Summary of responses

	N*	Number					Percentage					% Bottom two	% Top two
		Not familiar at all	Fairly familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	NA	Not familiar at all	Fairly familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	NA		
<b><u>User profile in relation to CAIDi</u></b>													
How familiar are you with the on-line Curriculum Approvals Information Database system (CAIDi)? .....	48	1	13	20	14		2.0	27.0	42.0	29.0		29.0	<b>71.0</b>
		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	NA	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
How frequently do you use CAIDi? .....	47	1	3	18	25		2.1	6.4	38.3	53.2		8.5	<b>91.5</b>
<b><u>Client satisfaction</u></b>													
	N*	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
To what extent are you satisfied with the following services provided by Academic Policy Services in relation to Curriculum Management?													
On-line proposal forms .....	24	0	4	13	7	15	0.0	16.7	54.2	29.2		16.7	<b>83.3</b>
On-line change forms .....	25	0	5	12	8	14	0.0	20.0	48.0	32.0		20.0	<b>80.0</b>
On-line access to curriculum data .....	34	0	5	15	14	5	0.0	14.7	44.1	41.2		14.7	<b>85.3</b>
Self-reporting for curriculum data .....	25	0	3	14	8	14	0.0	12.0	56.0	32.0		12.0	<b>88.0</b>
Technical support (including help desk and advisory service) .....	31	0	2	12	17	8	0.0	6.5	38.7	54.8		6.5	<b>93.5</b>
Web-based CAIDi advice sheets .....	18	1	1	10	6	21	5.6	5.6	55.6	33.3		11.1	<b>88.9</b>
		Not at all	To some extent	Extensively	Fully	NA	Not at all	To some extent	Extensively	Fully	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
To what extent has the availability of self-serve reporting tools in CAIDi provided a positive impact on your workflow? .....	32	7	15	7	3	7	22.0	47.0	22.0	9.0		69.0	<b>31.0</b>

\*N = Number of responses

## **Comments or suggestions for improvement**

Self-reporting tools allow easy access to information that would usually have to be gathered manually, or not existent at all. Self-reporting is something I use very frequently across a variety of tasks.

The overall change proposal form process is long-winded and difficult. Also it's not clear when changes for the new year are to be made and then when they are, some parts of the form are not accessible for change e.g. change of start and end dates for NTSP. Then one has to write to the Team to ask for permission so that those sections are made available. For busy unit coordinators this process is time consuming

Wishlist: Would like to be able to open all units at once during the final check for unit availabilities to enable single submission

I need to learn more about them to use them to best advantage.

To make this work we should have free access to it to be able to make changes to our units. As it stands I have to send emails to admin people to ask them if they could please make the changes or if they can grant me access to make them, so it's a waste of their time and our time.

We are not always certain of what is accurate on the system as we have found many anomalies. Also many of the fields with non-standard teaching periods is repetitive and perhaps could be merged.

It's just more administrative to deal with, and the deadlines are ridiculous. It grossly interferes with the teaching/research nexus that used to be at the heart of a teaching and research academic's existence. If I want to share my intellectual excitement with students about discoveries I am making, I can't, because 10-12 months previously the system locked me into teaching something else.

CAIDI seems very helpful after our period of adjustment.

On the change forms it is irritating that there has to be a rationale for every change. Rationale for significant changes I can understand but it would be less time consuming not to have to explain a change of grammar or punctuation, for instance.

Online change forms are difficult to use. Also, when I make no changes to unit outcomes, CAIDI shows that I've made changes to that section (perhaps other sections too such as teaching period - can't recall as haven't done it for a while).

Better reporting/informing at very early change stage between owning School/Faculty and other Schools/Faculties with significant stakeholder interest in unit/major/course

<b>Communication</b>	N*	Ineffective	Not very effective	Effective	Very effective	NA	Ineffective	Not very effective	Effective	Very effective	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
How effective is the Faculty Reference Group* in providing a clear communication platform for curriculum related matters?.....	24	3	10	6	5	14	12.5	41.7	25.0	20.8		54.2	<b>45.8</b>
		Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
How would you rate the quality of information and advice you have received from Academic Policy Services in relation to Curriculum Management?.....	34	1	6	10	17	4	3.0	18.0	29.0	50.0		21.0	<b>79.0</b>
		Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always	NA	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
Has the Curriculum Management Team listened to any feedback provided and taken appropriate action in regards to feedback concerning Curriculum Management? .....													
Team members listened to my feedback.....	27	1	4	8	14	11	3.7	14.8	29.6	51.9		18.5	<b>81.5</b>
Appropriate action was taken.....	28	1	5	12	10	10	3.6	17.9	42.9	35.7		21.4	<b>78.6</b>
		Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
How would you rate the response time when you made an enquiry? .....	30	0	3	10	17	8	0.0	10.0	33.0	57.0		10.0	<b>90.0</b>
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
<b>General</b>	N*												
Overall, how satisfied have you been with the quality of service provided by Academic Policy Services in relation to Curriculum Management?.....	35	0	7	10	18	3	0.0	20.0	29.0	51.0		20.0	<b>80.0</b>

### **General comments and suggestions**

It would be good to get some more structure around NSTP (in particular, to make them re-usable by many units)

It does feel like that for every year, there have been changes in the expectations of administrators at Faculty-level in the roll out of new policy and initiatives through APS. There is an increasing fatigue of the growing list of requirements, be it the requirement of curriculum mapping or the changes that will result from the Assessment Policy.

I would like to see a broader pragmatism applied to how curriculum is managed, recognising that even though a unit has gone through all the appropriate approval processes - a unit coordinator can still teach it how they deem appropriate. There is very little scope for administrators to change these behaviours.

I would suggest that a study be undertaken of CAIDi to demonstrate who is using the system within each Faculty. This would probably give a telling picture of who will bears the brunt of curriculum changes during Annual Course Review and through out the year. I recognise that the ability to submit is tightly controlled, however further analysis should be done to see who is accessing CAIDi regularly and who is making changes or editing curriculum. This information could temper and inform the roll out of any further changes to CAIDi.

Overall I am unhappy about UWA systems and how they are disjointed and do not communicate to each other e.g. UMIS and CAIDi should be a unified system and should communicate to Backboard as well as other student systems. It is not also clear what the CAIDi system controls e.g. website content etc: this information should be available somewhere. I personally do not know what the Faculty Reference group does or who they are as well as the Curriculum Management team. It is not clear who we are supposed to approach when we want to change or correct something e.g. start and finish dates for units. Overall CAIDi and other systems within UWA are a complete maze and information should be more readily available to unit coordinators.

APS are too stuck in the 'rules' and make things very inefficient.

I have surveys. They never allow me to qualify a response. I would have replied to the response time question with "Variable" as I have had both good and not so good responses this year.

The system is cumbersome and hard to use or not available to the academics; so we rely on admin staff to make any (even minor) changes. This often results in errors due to poor communication or misunderstandings between academics and administrative staff.

APS are always very professional, efficient and helpful.

The system could do with better intergration of fields and the support staff is helpful. The system is sometimes slow during busy times and doesn't always save data properly which is concerning despite using the browser that best supports CAIDi.

Upon receiving the link to complete this survey, my initial thoughts were "who are Academic Policy Services?" and "what is this Curriculum Management?" Considering I am teaching intensive and responsible for a rather large curriculum at this University, it is abysmal that I don't know these terms. None of my colleagues would either. CAIDi I have heard of and used several times. Even so, everything I know about CAIDi I learned through word of mouth. For a system so critical to our activities to have so little information available to the people who need it is just crazy. This University has serious issues with communication. As for my suggestions for change: I strongly recommend separating aspects of unit descriptions into those that need to go through an academic review process (e.g. major rules and structures, new courses and units) and those that really don't (learning outcomes, assessment breakdowns, unit prerequisites) so teaching academics can make changes to their units in a timely fashion. We had a typo in this year's handbook that allowed students to enrol in two incompatible units in second semester and it is most frustrating that we cannot correct that typo even for 2016, we need to go through the CAIDi system before April and make the changes for 2017 instead. This is ludicrous and results in much double-handling by staff as in the meantime we need to field student enquiries, manually search for students taking incompatible units, and deal with the consequences of what is essentially just a typo, all because the system prevents us from issuing a timely correction.

To be honest, I have no idea who Academic Policy Services even are. Are they the same people who introduced the new assessment policy without consultation? There are too many managers interfering with the work of too few academics at this university. I wonder how many of the policy wonks in the APS have set foot in a classroom lately.

One improvement could be making 'course' information better searchable. E.g. For Honours you can't search what course codes different unit-sets/majors are offered in, you can only view the major/unit-set itself. Honours programs should not only be listed/approved as a unit-set, but by course (course code) as well. The frequency of teaching period changes should also be addressed. More work needs to be done to ensure better thought goes into proposing teaching periods accurately when initial approval is sought for units, so changes are minimal. This doesn't seem to be a priority at the time of approval and it is assumed that it will just be changed later. Thought should also be put inot choosing the teaching period in which a course will commence, as this determines the admission periods that are set-up. Manual work-arounds often have to be used to get around mistakes, rather than setting courses up correctly the first time.

All good.

It would be nice to see CAIDi develop into a one source of truth tool. Currently we use UMIS, CAIDi, Socrates for tracking of units, academic progress. It was noted last year by one of our academics they their research output did not flow into the teaching formats therefore inaccurately reflecting their workload. A few years ago when UMIS was created this was to provide one portal which all unit information could be housed. We are now regressing with CAIDi now feeding UMIS but still checking needing to be done on UMIS to update CAIDi. We now have a new database for timetabling and the examinations process is becoming increasing less regulated with responsibility being devolved to Schools. CAIDi is great but thought needs to be put into incorporating UMIS into it and maybe even a portal where timetabling and venues also be incorporated. The examinations process possibly is not suitable to add but as there is an assessment section in CAIDi maybe this could be manipulated to at least fill in stage one examination data. Just a thought....

### Respondents by Area and Staff Type

<u>Area</u>	<u>Academic</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Total</u>
Faculty	3	10	13
School	14	8	22
Central Administration	1	12	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>48</b>

## ACADEMIC POLICY SERVICES CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY – 2015 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Suggestion for improvement	Planned Action / Comment
Would like to be able to open all units at once during the final check for unit availabilities to enable single submission	Bulk September updates have already been implemented to allow many units to be submitted at once, and will be communicated widely this year.
It would be good to get some more structure around NSTP (in particular, to make them re-usable by many units)	Refer to the Student Systems team – responsible for the management of this data
Many of the fields with non-standard teaching periods is repetitive and perhaps could be merged	Refer to the Student Systems team – responsible for the management of this data
Reduce the need for a rationale for every change	31% of fields no longer require rationale, based on previous approval statistics and the policies. This will be reviewed as needed.
Better reporting/informing at an early change stage between owning School/Faculty and other Schools/ Faculties with significant stakeholder interest in unit/major/course	Any changes to courses which include units from other Faculties now alert those Faculties on submission.
The system could do with better integration of fields and the support staff is helpful. The system is sometimes slow during busy times and doesn't always save data properly which is concerning despite using the browser that best supports CAIDi.	The speed is a symptom of many users on the server, but we will contact BI&TS and discover what traffic limitations the CAIDi servers have and whether this can be increased. Any bugs relating to saving have been fixed when identified by users, and have not recurred in approximately the last six months.
One improvement could be making 'course' information better searchable eg For Honours you can't search what course codes different unit-sets/ majors are offered in, you can only view the major/unit-set itself. Honours programs should not only be listed/approved as a unit-set, but by course (course code) as well	CAIDi does not manage the undergraduate degrees, but the degree course for each major or honours is listed on its Summary page and you can filter your search results for those curriculum types by Degree.
The frequency of teaching period changes should also be addressed. More work needs to be done to ensure better thought goes into proposing teaching periods accurately when initial approval is sought for units, so changes are minimal. This doesn't seem to be a priority at the time of approval and it is assumed that it will just be changed later.	Refer to Faculty colleagues via the Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group for discussion. Faculty responsibility to ensure data provided in relation to teaching periods is accurate.
Thought should also be put into choosing the teaching period in which a course will commence, as this determines the admission periods that are set-up. Manual work-arounds often have to be used to get around mistakes, rather than setting course up correctly the first time.	Refer to Faculty colleagues via the Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group for discussion. Faculty responsibility to ensure data provided in relation to teaching periods and course commencement is accurate.
It would be nice to see CAIDi develop into a one source of truth tool.	CAIDi was designed as a short/medium term curriculum approval process, pending further development of Callista (or its successor). A single source of truth tool is part of the IT Transformation project and supported by APS