Student Centred Engagement: Strategic Enhancement Across the Whole Institution.

Katie Hartless Rose, Abigail Hirshman Alun Evans, Stacey Tilling



Session Outline

- Focus on the institutional approach to addressing student satisfaction and experience since 2010
 - Background and Method
 - Results
 - Conclusions
 - Implications for practice
- Discussion to share practice



Some Context

- Coventry University post 1992 University & member of the University Alliance
- Key institution performance indicators include targets for NSS performance and league table positions
- Over the last 4 years we have been running a centralised internal evaluation process of all modules across the university to improve student satisfaction



The Setting

- CUReS was created four years ago to deliver module evaluations across the whole university.
- Have expanded significantly and now deliver other large and small scale surveys and evaluations.
 Employ students in the delivery process.
- Other activities include students as researchers internship, external research projects and professional training courses.
- Support and fund PhD's for research staff



What wasn't working...

- Prior to 2010, an online only system was in place for evaluations
- <10% response rates in most cases
- Lack of academic engagement
- No central administration
- Qualitative responses rarely examined



The questionnaire process.....

- Questionnaires administered in timetabled lectures by Student Research Support Staff (RSS)
- With the move to semesterisation, UG and PG modules are evaluated towards the end of each semester, plus end of year course surveys
- The average turnaround time to analyse and report on all questionnaires is 10 working days
- All reporting sent electronically to module tutors and management



Academic Engagement

- Academic engagement in the evaluation process has grown significantly
- Reduced academic administrative demands
- Staff awareness and buy-in has dramatically increased
- Module, Department and Faculty reports are now in demand
- Satisfaction levels are now tied in to Development Performance Reviews



The Survey Cycle.

The End of Year report is produced; provides feedback to all faculties CUReS creates and sends questionnaires to print

Packs are printed and scheduled for delivery over a predefined period

Faculty reports are created each semester

Student experience and satisfaction

Research Support Staff (RSS) distribute the forms in-class

CUReS

Coventry University Research Solutions Within 10 days of distribution, reports are emailed to relevant staff Packs are returned to CUReS and scanned, analysed and reported





CUReS



Some figures

- 59,837 questionnaire sheets across 2315 modules analysed and reported between November 2013 and August 2014
- Average of 98% turnaround within 10 working days across the whole period.
- Average student response rate up from 55% in 2010/11 to 66% in 2013/14
- One third of all modules surveyed in 2013-14 received 80-100% response rate



Using the data

- Reporting back to students on the results and actions taken using Moodle
- Data reported at module, course, department and faculty level
- Key areas for action can be easily identified
- Data used across staff development workshops, plus annual Teaching and Learning Conference



Example of module-level reporting

Question: 3 Good things

The module timetable operates as expected and changes are communicated clearly in advance

Response	Frequency	Percent
Definitely Agree	4	80.00
Mostly Agree	1	20.00
Neither Disagree or Agree	0	0.00
Mostly Disagree	D	0,00
Definitely Disagree	0	0.00
Not Applicable	0	

There is adequate access to specialist computer	
hardware and software required for this module	

Frequency	Percent
1	25.00
2	50.00
1	25 00
0	0.00
0	0.00
	1 2 1

needs on this		ices are	Summer	101	my
	-	I WAR TO THE TAX TO SHE			

Response	Frequency	y Percent						
Definitely Agree	0	0.00						
	3	75.00						
Neither Disagree or Agree	1	25.00						
Mostly Disagree	0	0.00						
Definitely Disagree	0	0.00						
Not Applicable	T							

There is adequate access to specialist equipment required for this module

Response	Frequency	Percent							
Definitely Agree	0	0.00							
Mostly Agree	2	66.67							
Neither Disagree or	1	33 33							
Agree		0.00							
Mostly Disagree	0	0.00							
Definitely Disagree	0	0.00							
Not Applicable	2								

Use of field trips

Respondent	Response
1.)	Phones startly up to three finings you there are good about this revolute a.c. of the phone that grant
2	Proceedings the frequently sent to be regularity to be the transportation to the process of the
5 S	Explicitly linking themper is provided to railer of concilet

4	a engraphic b information					
5	Power street, up in these traps you have any post around the models.					

accessibility to the labs

-0.000	CONTRACTOR OF STREET	Company of the Compan			
Overall the	quality	of this	module	is sa	tisfactory

Response	Frequency	Percent	
Definitely Agree	3	60.00	
Mostly Agree	2	40.00	
Neither	0	0.00	
Disagree or Agree			
Mostly Disagree	0	0.00	I
Definitely	0	0.00	
Disagree Not Applicative			

3 Good things	Changes
Good lecturer :)	Provide a couple of 1:1 sessions to help provide personal feedback
	More clarity on the coursework, more

CUReS



Departmental and Faculty level reporting

Response	Staff teaching on this module are good at explaining things clearly.	Staff teaching on this module make the subject interesting.	Staff teaching on this module are enthusiastic about what they are teaching.	The module is melectually stimulating and engaging.	The materials used by the staff have enhanced my learning.	Module information (module guide, timetable and assessment requirements) is available on OUOnline Moode.	CUChine is used effectively to support my learning.	Staff teaching on this module are well prepared.	Classes usually start and finish on time.	The assessment requirements on this module are clear.	Hand-In dates and coursework return dates are clearly defined	Feedback on any returned work has been useful to develop my understanding of the module content.	Sufficient academic advice and support on this module are available.	Staff teaching on this module are available when they say they will be.	The module timetable operates as expected and changes are communicated clearly in advance.	Library resources and services are sufficient for my needs on this module.	There is adequate access to specialist computer hardware and software required for this module.	There is adequate access to specialist equipment required for this module.	Overall the quality of this modale is satisfactory.
% Total sas	70	70	71	40	90	93	93	73	73	73	100	50	77	86	82	466	83	83	70
% Total sat	92	69	- 99	100	79	93	100	93	100	93	93	.62	.79	-93	86		99	86	- 93
% Total sat	92	92	83	- 1	83	92	91	92	.92	92	100	91	100	100	100	91	100	82	92
% Total sat	74 100	100		83	88	89 88	2	84	100	84	94	80 83	78 94	89 84	82	88	93		-76
% Total sat % Total sat	97	74	97	70	78	95	89	91	97	90	91	80	99	01	84	84	777		97 91
% Total sat	97	91	100	82	97	. 94	94	99	92	87	1	200	95	95	97	92	92	. 93	97
% Total sat	100	100	100	98	100	100	95	200	-56	93	786	95	97	96	85	91-	91	92	97
% Total sat	100	97	100	94	94	100	97	100	100	97	100	89	91	100	100	90	80	91	100
% Total sat	81	225	95			99	85	95	99	98	335.	79	91	94	93	88	65.		85
% Total sat	96	-90	98	84	84	91	89	96	93	90	94		90	92	91	86	69		87
% Total sat	98	82	100	82	84	100	92	200	.96	95	.95	83	87	98	96	92	100		96
% Total sat	100	100	100	78	79	100	300	300	100	76	100	100	88	100	100	100	50	100	100
% Total sat	100	90	95	85	85	90	98	93	95	82	85	95	9.2	.90	95	90	87	87	90
% Total sat	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
% Total sat	77	57	86	71		86	86	86	100		85	50	71	-86	86	- 07	660		-73
% Total sat	100	100	96	100	49.	100		7	-95	93	100	77	89	-94	100	84	62	54)	95
% Total sat	100	100	100	100	100	100	190	100	100	- 19	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	94
% Total sat	100	100	92	100	88	100	90	88	85	- 95	96	100	100	88	92	87 80	100	100	100
% Total sat % Total sat	100	100	100	92	100	100	83	100	100	100	100	83	83	100	100 97	80	100	100	92
% Total sat	88	75	54	10	82	81	83	94	94	-	34	57	81	87	63		400	50	73
% Total sat	94	94	100	89	100	54	81	100	100	200	100	28.	96	94	72 1	85	83	94	94
% Total sat	95	100	91	777.0	82	82	66	91	91	71	91		71	-90	82	86	- 10	77	82
% Total sat	96	92	100	92	88	96		96	100	88	92		92	88	88	84	60		96
% Total sat	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	94	100	94	100	100	100
% Total sat	100	100	100	92	596	100	96	100	100	96	96	63	\$100	.95	100	82	88	91	100
% Total sat	100	100	100	100	100	100	89	100	89	89	100	88	100	100	100	200	NA.	NA	100
% Total sat	89	45	81			81	83	87	85	80	87	- 67	74	80	(26)	75		63	83
% Total sat	1.00	100	100	93	100	100	100	200	100	100	100	100	100	100	300	300	100	100	100
% Total sat	90	500	90	75	80	50	85	300	:90	90	500	100	-90	30	30	50	100	3.00	100

CUReS



Important aspects

- Paper based format reaps better response rates
- Online format still available to off-campus modules or modules with unusual deliveries
- Reporting:
 - directly to the module tutors- qualitative and quantitative data
 - Higher level reporting departments/faculties
- The use of student support staff to distribute the questionnaires in timetabled lectures

CUReS



Positives

- Higher student satisfaction as constantly reviewing and responding to feedback
- Qualitative data now being reviewed regularly
- Higher response rate, so more accurate data
- General year-on-year improvements seen in feedback
- Student empowerment
- Staff empowerment/increased staff buy-in
- Four years worth of comparable data



Negatives

- Increasingly 'bulky' system as the scope keeps growing
- Some continual issues with integrating all faculties under one system
- Costs of paper, printing, delivery and analysis
- System reliant on many variables
- Room usage/abusage
- Some questions provide unreliable data
- Survey Fatigue?



Some key findings – lessons learned

- Misunderstanding of the meaning of questions common amongst students, even after embedding the process into the whole university
- Misunderstanding of 'neither disagree nor agree' and 'not applicable'
- The importance of having a baseline of data and evidence to inform strategic interventions.
- Impact of changing semester structures/term structures





Score Definitions

 Definitely Agree: You are happy with this aspect of the course



 Mostly Agree: You are generally happy/are okay with this aspect of the course



 Neither Disagree nor Agree: Things are 'so-so' but need improving.
 This is a <u>NEGATIVE</u> response



 Mostly Disagree: You are generally unhappy with this aspect. Things need to be improved



 Definitely Disagree: You are very unhappy with this aspect. There is a major problem



IMPORTANT

The only neutral response is **NOT APPLICABLE**

 Not applicable: This question is not applicable to this module at this time



Discussion



- Do you have a whole institution approach in your university?
- What are your institutional drivers for student satisfaction survey?
- How useful/problematic is it to have the neither agree/disagree box?

