

Title: Teaching for quality – experiences implementing a university-wide module evaluation form

Presenters: Suzy Jagger and Julie Hall
University of Roehampton

Abstract:

Session Learning Outcomes

By the end of this session, delegates will be able to:

- 1) Have an awareness of the different measurement methods for evaluation of modules based on current research.
- 2) Have a critical understanding of the issues associated with development of a measuring tool to evaluate teaching from both a university and departmental perspective.
- 3) Have an critical understanding of the issues involved with implementing a module evaluation form across a university based on the experiences at Roehampton.

Session Outline

Key issues to be addressed are:

Often when we reflect on our own practice, our assumptions of success are not necessarily in line with what students believe they have experienced. There can also be a disconnect between what a student believes is important for learning and what they have experienced, and what the practitioner thinks based on her/his own experience. Student conceptions of learning and knowledge will change over time (Saljo, 1979, Perry, 1970) and Gibbs comments on the perceptions of sophisticated and unsophisticated students – the latter may judge a *good* learning experience as supplying lecture notes and tests of memory to enable learning by rote, whereas the former as supporting independent learning and developing one's own confidence in a subject area (Gibbs, 2010). These are issues that suggest student feedback cannot necessarily be relied upon to provide an accurate measure of quality teaching and yet there is evidence to support the view that student feedback for measuring quality can be 'highly reliable' (p.27) but that it is the measurement tool used which will determine its effectiveness. So, what should be the content of a module evaluation form and how should they be used? Research (Trigwell 2004, Titus 2008, Kember and Wong 2000) has identified a number of approaches to questionnaires such as "The Student Evaluation of Educational Quality" (Gibbs and Coffey, 2004). There is some evidence to show an improvement in the sophistication of teachers' thinking but also questions about validity, survey fatigue and bias.

The paper discusses the pros and cons of module evaluation forms as a method of measurement in the light research such as that mentioned above and experience from

implementation of a University-wide initiative at the University of Roehampton and identifies issues encountered during implementation and lessons learned. This will be a useful session for delegates considering using a module evaluation process or reviewing their current one.

Session Activities and Approximate Timings

- 1) Introduction and welcome – will seek to hear how many of the delegates have experience of using cross university module evaluation processes (5 mins)
- 2) Presentation of research findings and issues linked to enhancing teaching through use of module evaluation surveys (15 mins)
- 3) Discussion (pairs and then groups) 15 mins:
 - a) Should a standard module evaluation form be implemented across a department?
 - b) What is appropriate content for a module evaluation form in the light of research?
 - c) What processes can encourage buy in and a commitment to critical reflection in response to student views?
- 4) Presentation -The University of Roehampton Process and lessons learned (10 mins)

References

- Gibbs, G., (2010) Dimensions of Quality, Higher Education Academy, http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/news/detail/dimensions_of_quality_report Accessed 30/4/2012
- Gibbs, G. and Coffey, M. (2004) The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*. 5 (1), pp 87–100.
- Kember, D. and Wong, A. (2000) Implications for evaluation from a study of students' perceptions of good and poor teaching. *Higher Education* 40, 69 – 97
- Perry, W. G. (1970) *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: a scheme*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.
- Säljö, R. (1979) Learning about learning. *Higher Education*. 8 (4), pp 443–451.
- Titus, J.J. (2008) Student ratings in a consumerist academy: leveraging pedagogical control and authority. *Sociological Perspectives* 51 (2), 397 – 422
- Trigwell, K. and Ashwin, P. (2004) Undergraduate students' experience at the University of Oxford. Oxford: Oxford Learning Institute. Available from: www.learning.ox.ac.uk/oli.php?page=365 [April 2010].