

CENTRAL CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT - CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY 2016 - RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

TRIM FILE REFERENCE: F37868

FILE PATH ON SERVER: X:\CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT\CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT\DOCUMENTATION AND REPORTS\CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY\2016 -10 OCTOBER

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	20 th December 2016	Mr Maxwell Keeble (Executive Officer, Curriculum Committee)
1.0	Kath Williams	Final version – incorporating feedback received – for approval	23 rd December 2016	Professor Grady Venville, Dean of Coursework Studies

DOCUMENT APPROVAL

Approved By (name/position of approver)	Date
Professor Grady Venville, Dean of Coursework Studies	6 th January 2017

BACKGROUND

A key goal for the central Curriculum Management team 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%**.

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

Recommendations	Current Status
Formulate an exemplar service partnership agreement (SPAs) for each Faculty.	Completed – exemplar endorsed by selected faculties. However in light of the Renewal Project further consideration will be given as to whether or not we align with the Service Level Partnerships (SLPs) being developed for each Service Delivery Centre or develop a separate agreement.
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’.	Ongoing – Attachment A 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, Training/Walk through, Web presence.
Encourage faculty colleagues to strengthen their communication strategy to ensure local curriculum management processes and timelines are understood.	Ongoing – the introduction of Service Delivery Centres provides an opportunity to revisit this and this will be a topic for discussion at the next Faculty Reference Group meeting scheduled for early 2017.
Conduct the customer satisfaction survey annually in October to monitor and measure progress.	Conducted annually –third survey undertaken in Oct/Nov 2016.

2016 SURVEY

A third survey was conducted in October/November 2016 and a total of 284 stakeholders were asked to evaluate the services provided, in relation to curriculum management, during 2016. The attached report (**Attachment B**), prepared by the Office of Strategy, Planning and Performance, presents the results of the latest 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 all three surveys:

	2014	2015	2016
Overall level of customer satisfaction	80.6%	80%	90.3%
Customer satisfaction in the area of services provided	Average 88.33%	Average 86.5%	Average 77.98%
Respondents	48 (18 Academic and 30 Professional staff)	48 (18 Academic and 30 Professional staff)	49 (28 Academic and 21 Professional staff)
Invitees	160	167	284
Response rate	30%	29%	17%

Some key messages have emerged from the recent survey:

- While it is recognised that some of the survey outcomes have dropped, the survey confirmed that the overall level of customer satisfaction has shown a marked increase and continues to be high.
- Communication continues to be a strength within the central curriculum management team.
- The quality of information and advice received from the central curriculum management team continues to rise steadily. This confirmed that an outcome from the previous surveys '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' had been successfully achieved.
- The Renewal Project provides an opportunity for Faculties to revisit their local curriculum management processes to ensure that these are well understood and clearly communicated.

SERVICES PROVIDED

Client satisfaction in relation to specific curriculum management services continues to be high. It has however, been recognised that services have shown to have had a decrease in the level of customer satisfaction experienced as follows:

Service	2014:	2015:	2016:
On-line proposal forms	92.9%	83.3%	81.5%
On-line change forms	83.9%	80%	76.9%
On-line access to curriculum data	93.5%	85.3%	83.9%
Self-reporting for curriculum data	83.4%	88%	73.1%
Technical Support (including help desk and advisory service)	90%	93.5%	78.6%
Web-based CAIDi advice sheets	86.3%	88.9%	73.9%

'It is a complex system and it is hard to see content that has not been approved.'
'It's hard to read each section and response time is too long'

Some comments suggest a lack of awareness.

'I am not aware of the web based CAIDi advice sheets.'
'I would like to get access to curriculum data and CAIDi advice sheets, but don't know how.'

The current survey was opened up to a larger target audience than in previous years and there was a shift in the number of respondents by area and staff type as shown above. This may explain the 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@uwa.edu.au. In addition consideration will be given to how new/infrequent users can be better informed/supported.

COMMUNICATION

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

Service		2014:	2015:	2016:
How effective is the Faculty Reference Group		54.6%	45.8%	100%
Quality of information and advice received from central Curriculum Management Team		78.6%	79%	85.2%
Has the Curriculum Management team listened to feedback and appropriate action taken	Team members listened to my feedback	85%	81.5%	87.5%
	Appropriate action was taken	70%	78.6%	94.1%
Response time when making an enquiry		84.6%	90%	92%

'The Curriculum Management team are extremely helpful and great to work with.'

'Very satisfied with the Curriculum Management team; particularly Maxwell Keeble, who has provided sage advice on how best to tackle complicated curriculum matters.'

'Generally, I have found the team have been very patient with us!'

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

'CAIDi itself and the process to undertake it is not advertised directly enough to incoming staff. Curriculum Management is such an important thing to know about including how to do it. Perhaps more of a clear presence on the University, faculty/school web pages would help.'

'I didn't even know you existed. And I do a lot of teaching so it would have been very helpful to know about you!'

Further work is required at the Faculty level to ensure their local curriculum management processes are well understood by relevant faculty staff. The outcomes of the renewal project

provide an opportunity for processes to be revisited and this will be a topic for discussion at the next Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group.

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:

- Revisit the need to have a separate service partnership agreement (SPAs)/service level partnership (SLPs) for stakeholders versus the SLPs being developed for each Service Delivery Centre.
- Continue to demonstrate the team's commitment to improve customer service and communication by actioning suggestions for improvement (where 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 all University staff responsible for developing and managing curriculum and other relevant stakeholders.
- Encourage faculty colleagues to strengthen their communication strategy to ensure local management processes and timelines are understood.
- Continue to conduct the customer satisfaction survey annually in September/October to monitor and measure progress.

NEXT STEPS

Action	Timeline
Report to the Dean of Coursework Studies	23 rd December 2016
Publish report on UWA Curriculum Management webpages	January 2017
Feedback to survey respondents	January 2017
Agenda item – Curriculum Committee	15 th February 2017
Curriculum Management Faculty Reference Group - discussion opportunity on feedback provided in the survey in relation to communication at the faculty level	February 2017
Agenda item – Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning)	TBD

CENTRAL CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY – 2015 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

‘You Asked – We Did’

Suggestion for improvement - 2015 Survey	Action taken
Would like to be able to open all units at once during the final check for unit availabilities to enable single submission	Completed – Bulk September updates allow many units to be submitted at once
It would be good to get some more structure around NSTP (in particular, to make them re-usable by many units)	On track to be completed by February 2017
Many of the fields with non-standard teaching periods is repetitive and perhaps could be merged	
Reduce the need for a rationale for every change	Completed – 31% of fields no longer require rationale
Better reporting/informing at an early change stage between owning School/Faculty and other Schools/ Faculties with significant stakeholder interest in unit/major/course	Completed – any change 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.	Ongoing – Improving system functionality continually being investigated and improved upon, where possible. For instance search speed has been improved.
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	No action required - 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.	Referred to Faculty whose responsibility it is 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.	
It would be nice to see CAIDi develop into a one source of truth tool.	Ongoing - 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 the central Curriculum Management Team

Academic Policy Services Customer Satisfaction Survey 2016

Survey period: October-November, 2016

Number of invitees: 284

Number of respondents: 49

Response rate: 17%

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		
<u>User profile in relation to CAIDi</u>													
How familiar are you with the on-line Curriculum Approvals Information Database system (CAIDi)?	48	2	16	19	11		4.2	33.3	39.6	22.9		37.5	62.5
		Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	NA	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Frequently	NA	% Bottom two	% Top two
How frequently do you use CAIDi?	45	0	5	26	14		0.0	11.1	57.8	31.1		11.1	88.9
<u>Client satisfaction</u>													
	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	27	1	4	15	7		3.7	14.8	55.6	25.9		18.5	81.5
On-line change forms	26	1	5	14	6		3.9	19.2	53.9	23.1		23.1	76.9
On-line access to curriculum data	31	2	3	18	8		6.5	9.7	58.1	25.8		16.1	83.9
Self-reporting for curriculum data	26	2	5	13	6		7.7	19.2	50.0	23.1		26.9	73.1
Technical support (including help desk and advisory service)	28	1	5	10	12		3.6	17.9	35.7	42.9		21.4	78.6
Web-based CAIDi advice sheets	23	3	3	12	5		13.0	13.0	52.2	21.7		26.1	73.9
		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	10	14	4	4		31.25	43.75	12.5	12.5		75	25

*N = Number of responses

Comments or suggestions for improvement

It is a complex system and it is hard to see content that has not been approved. Because of the very complex and protracted approval system, it is therefore hard to see and understand information under revision.

I am not aware of the web based CAIDi advice sheets. I remember looking to a real person for reassurance that my answers were appropriate .

It's hard to read each section and response time is too long.

There are improvements that could be made to online reporting and forms and we make suggestions to APS while we are working through the various processes.

sometimes it is hard to navigate to the webpage caidi advice sheets if you don't have a link or a bookmark not sure what if anything could be done to improve this

I have only used Caidi twice to establish 2 new units. I have not used any change processes yet. I originally had some issues with the form doing silly things, but this was quickly addressed by the very helpful support staff.

Tools in CAIDi are good; the format of the data & its slight differences from the way things are coded in Callista makes matching difficult

It would be good to have some drop down menus for common areas in assessment etc. to avoid having to enter similar information each time. Drop down menu for non-standard teaching periods. We have to enter for every unit and provide justification each time so very time consuming.

Consultation flow should appear in Caidi

Having research courses on CAIDi would be helpful.

Having CRICOS codes included would be helpful as we currently have to cross reference.

I didn't know most of these things existed. I would quite like to get access to curriculum data and CAIDi advice sheets but don't know how.

Communication		<i>N*</i>	Ineffective	Not very effective	Effective	Very effective	NA	Ineffective	Not very effective	Effective	Very effective	NA	% <i>Bottom two</i>	% <i>Top two</i>
How effective is the Faculty Reference Group* in providing a clear communication platform for curriculum related matters?.....		6	0	0	5	1		0.0	0.0	83.3	16.7		0.0	100.0
			Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	% <i>Bottom two</i>	% <i>Top two</i>
How would you rate the quality of information and advice you have received from Academic Policy Services in relation to Curriculum Management?.....		27	0	4	11	12		0.0	14.8	40.7	44.4		14.8	85.2
Has the Curriculum Management Team listened to any feedback provided and taken appropriate action in regards to feedback concerning Curriculum Management?			Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always	NA	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always	NA	% <i>Bottom two</i>	% <i>Top two</i>
Team members listened to my feedback.....		16	0	2	2	12		0.0	12.5	12.5	75.0		12.5	87.5
Appropriate action was taken.....		17	0	1	7	9		0.0	5.9	41.2	52.9		5.9	94.1
			Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	NA	% <i>Bottom two</i>	% <i>Top two</i>
How would you rate the response time when you made an enquiry?		25	0	2	9	14		0.0	8.0	36.0	56.0		8.0	92.0
General		<i>N*</i>	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	NA	% <i>Bottom two</i>	% <i>Top two</i>
Overall, how satisfied have you been with the quality of service provided by Academic Policy Services in relation to Curriculum Management?.....		31	1	2	18	10		3.2	6.5	58.1	32.3		9.7	90.3

General comments and suggestions

This is the first time I have been asked to provide feedback, thus my responses 'not applicable' to the last question. My feedback is largely this - CAIDI itself and the process to undertake it is not advertised directly enough to incoming staff. Curriculum management is such an important thing to know about including how to do it. Perhaps more of a clear presence on the university, faculty/school web pages would help. Something like...Managing curriculum changes for each unit and for whole courses happens via CAIDI. Suggested changes, with the approval of line managers, are made online via this link ###. Once suggested changes are submitted they firstly go to 'here' for approval and, in the case of more significant changes to the curriculum to 'here' for approval. You will be notified of approvals to curriculum changes 'add how'. (Are we notified of approval? I was asked by the Discipline Chair to submit the requested changes but I don't remember being notified once the process was completed. If this presently doesn't happen for the person who submitted the changes it would be very helpful to do so.). The quality of the team itself is probably very high but at present there seems to me to be a missing piece of vital but quite basic information - once you are in the university system how do you find out about this thing called CAIDI - there is no clue in the acronym.

The Curriculum Management team are extremely helpful and great to work with.

My main dealings are through the Faculty of Science and very limited with the central CM team.

As we are outside of a school we have very limited information flows to us regarding Curriculum Management, and thus we are usually trying to do things with little knowledge. Generally, I have found the team have been very patient with us!

I just find CAIDI hard to navigate - it isn't intuitive at all. And as you only need to come to it when you change a unit, you forget between one time and the next. The philosophy is good but the delivery is poor.

Very satisfied with the Curriculum Management Team; particularly Maxwell Keeble, who has provided sage advice on how best to tackle complicated curriculum matters.

I didn't even know you existed. And I do a lot of teaching so it would have been very helpful to know about you!
Response time to the rule waivers in particular is fantastic. Thank you

Respondents by Area and Staff Type

<u>Area</u>	<u>Academic</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Total</u>
School	21	9	30
Faculty	5	6	11
Central Administration	2	6	8
Total	28	21	49

CENTRAL CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY – 2016 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Year of Survey	Suggestion for improvement	Planned Action / Comment
2015	It would be good to get some more structure around NSTP (in particular, to make them re-usable by many units)	On track to be completed by February 2017.
	Many of the fields with non-standard teaching periods is repetitive and perhaps could be merged	
	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.	Ongoing – Improving system functionality continually being investigated and improved upon, where possible. For instance search speed has been improved.
	It would be nice to see CAIDi develop into a one source of truth tool.	Ongoing - 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 the central Curriculum Management Team
2016	It would be good to have some drop down menus for common areas in assessment etc. to avoid having to enter similar information each time.	In train to be considered during 2017
	Consultation flow should appear in CAIDi	In train to be considered during 2017, with consultation for Broadening Category A units to be introduced by March
	Having CRICOS codes included would be helpful as we currently have to cross reference	In train to be considered during 2017
	Having Research Courses in CAIDi would be helpful	Completed (You asked we did) – Postgraduate research courses (GRS) are now available in CAIDi
	I was asked by the Discipline Chair to submit the requested changes, but I don't remember being notified once the process was completed	No action required- CAIDi generates automated emails