Faculty USE Processes 2011

The SEG Education committee has called for faculties to report on how they are responding to issues identified in their USE and/or other Unit of Study, student experience data.

Faculties determine the process by which they schedule, order, consider and respond to USE data. Faculties also set their own benchmarks and standards against which to judge performance.

Through the ITL- Associate Deans L&T Group, advice is available to assist faculties in designing processes that meet their faculty needs, setting appropriate standards, interpreting data and planning suitable responses.

This table summarises the USE process reported by each faculty (as at June 2011) under four stages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>Summary of Faculty Unit of Study Evaluation Processes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td>How is unit of study evaluation instigated? How is the plan for evaluation communicated to staff and students? How are the four faculty items determined? How is a USE order placed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example:</strong></td>
<td>The faculty L&amp;T c’tee discussed how we would fulfil the uni req. We consulted with staff about the processes they used and looked at what other faculties were doing. The c’tee made a recommendation to the Dean who formulated the faculty policy / statement and provided leadership in ensuring implementation. We held a forum on the USE system for all staff and students and it was compulsory for staff to attend. We used this to design the four faculty items and negotiated a We involved UoS coordinators in drawing up a schedule of evaluation through consultation with program coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consideration</td>
<td>How are the data and results from evaluations considered by the faculty? Who receives data? In what form? How does the faculty make a judgment about the quality of units? What benchmarks or standards are used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example:</strong></td>
<td>The teaching and learning committee receives the summary report, the spreadsheet and considered the USE Performance Report on the Dean’s behalf. We identify excellent units and those where results suggest we should investigate further. The c’tee decided on the standards – currently – these are set at 90% agreement for excellence and 20% disagreement for poor performance on a combination of four USE items only 2, 3, 6 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Action</td>
<td>What happens as a result of the consideration of the results of evaluation? How are improvements planned, and supported? How are successes celebrated? How are students informed about the actions taken in response to their feedback? How is a record of these actions maintained? How are HOS/ faculty level issues responded to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example:</strong></td>
<td>The excellent units receive a letter of commendation from the dean and are invited to present a seminar on their teaching. Those with low scores are invited to meet with the A/Dean L&amp;T to clarify the situation. If there really is a problem they are asked to put forward recommendations for how the issues will be addressed next time the unit is taught. They are also given the opportunity to work with a peer or to come to a group meeting with the T&amp;L C’tee to discuss possible ways forward. Each UoS outline includes a paragraph about the ways the unit has developed in response to feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)</td>
<td>How can the faculty show that these processes are happening and that they are leading to improvements? How does the Department / School / faculty report upwards about the implementation of the system for the evaluation of units of study and the outcomes of the evaluation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example:</strong></td>
<td>Each HoS prepares a report for the Dean of the results and this is published on the faculty web – just overall figures not individual units. The report also notes the key aspects that were seen as weak and strong and identifies any overall faculty issues such as teaching spaces / resources etc. The T&amp;L C’tee has oversight for monitoring that planned improvements happen and that units with poor scores are scheduled for re-surveying the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory Notes</td>
<td>Context / culture. What are the characteristics of the faculty or academic culture that have impacted how these systems have been developed and implemented? Are there other systems or features that are relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For example:</strong></td>
<td>The leadership of the Dean was important in helping the L&amp;T C’tee to introduce the new system and ensure that staff felt they were going to be supported in responding to feedback gathered this way. The focus on supporting people rather than punishing them was an important aspect to communicate. The faculty promotion committee also met with the L&amp;T C’tee to discuss appropriate ways to use the data in promotions. Using the introductory forum to generate the four faculty items helped staff to understand some of the constraints of the system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1. Preparation

The A/Dean for T&L coordinates USE orders for FAFNR in each semester. All units are evaluated in their first year of teaching, and then on a cycle of two years in every three after that. A unit which achieves scores below that of the faculty benchmark is automatically included for evaluation again the following year. The list of units to be evaluated is circulated each semester and UoS co-ordinators may nominate their UoS for evaluation if desired.

### 2. Consideration

The A/Dean for T&L receives the summary reports from the ITL and then presents these at the T&L Committee. Units with scores for overall satisfaction <3 are highlighted by the T&L Committee for follow-up. With the introduction of the AGRICULTURE USE Performance platform, units with less than 75% agreement for the overall satisfaction question are highlighted for follow-up.

### 3. Action

If low scores are reported for a particular unit (<3 or <75% agreement for Q. 12), this is discussed during T&L meetings. Depending on circumstances, the T&L Committee may call on the UoS coordinator of such a unit to provide some commentary on the evaluation results and/or a set of improvements to the unit for the following year. Alternatively, the A/Dean for T&L may follow the issue up with the unit coordinator more informally. Units with low scores are subject to evaluation in the following year to check if proposed changes have been effective. USE results are also discussed at meetings of the Staff Student Liaison committee.

### 4. Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

All unit coordinators are encouraged to summarise student evaluation results and to report these (plus proposed changes/improvements) to the next cohort of that unit. These summaries and responses to student feedback are made available to students and staff through Blackboard sites. Some lecturers choose to present their responses to earlier student feedback at the start of face-to-face teaching in the next semester.

### Explanatory Notes

FAFNR is one of the smaller faculties on campus. One concern raised by faculty members has been the issue of small sample sizes for the USE evaluation process, which in turn could produce skewed or unrepresentative results. Therefore, when USE scores are evaluated at the Faculty level, those units with fewer than ten USE respondents are not included in Faculty averages.

In terms of benchmarks, or aspirational results, using the 5 point scale, the FAFNR follows-up units with an overall satisfaction score (Q.12) of less than 3.0. A score of around 3.5-3.7 is regarded as average, while a score of >4.0 is regarded as a good result. Using the USE Performance platform, the FAFNR has agreed to aspire to all units achieving 75% agreement for Q.12 and less than 25% disagreement for Q.12.
### Architecture Design and Planning – UPDATED 9th May 2011

| **1. Preparation** | The Faculty of Architecture Design and Planning USE procedure requires all UoS to be evaluated through ITL based on a biennial cycle. In addition all new UoS will be evaluated and UoS coordinated by staff during their probation period will also be evaluated. UoS considered underperforming in the previous semester/year will be evaluated (refer to criteria in section 2). Faculty questions 8-11 are determined as necessary by the Faculty Education Committee.
A Faculty Master USE List (modeled on that to be submitted to ITL) is produced by the Faculty Education Manager identifying all UoS in the Faculty due for evaluation.
This Faculty Master List and a notice is distributed to the Associate Dean Education (AD(E)) and Heads of Discipline (HoD) requesting corrections and amendments.
An announcement goes out to all UoS coordinators.
UoS coordinators are also able to add UoS upon request and to specify whether the USE will be conducted online.
UoS coordinators of early intensives will need to make arrangements for the early ordering and distribution of the USE.
The Master List is amended as per advice from Heads of Discipline and staff and this is converted into a bulk order and sent to ITL via the web portal in Week 7.4. |
| **2. Consideration** | USE data and results are received by the Dean, Heads of School and individual UoS coordinators. UoS coordinators also receive students’ comments contained in the questionnaires.
The AD(E) and the Faculty Education Manager are sent the numerical data.
The HoD are sent the numerical data for UoS for the courses coordinated by their disciplines.
The Education Manager produces different levels of reports to identify high performing and under performing UoS, aggregate results and conducts trend analyses.
A detailed report is sent to the Dean and AD(E).
A summary aggregated report and trend analysis is tabled every semester at the Faculty Executive Group and the Education Committee.
The Education Committee discusses the results and the implications of underperforming items and determines actions at a Faculty level.
**UoS where all of the USE items (1-12) are at or above the agreement standard of 65% are considered commendable.**
**UoS where the overall satisfaction with the quality of the unit (Item 12) is at or above the disagreement standard of 15%; or where the response rate is less than 30% are considered to be underperforming.** |
| **3. Action** | Coordinators of UoS that are considered commendable under the current criteria receive a joint letter of congratulation from the Dean and AD(E). A list of these commendations will be listed in a Faculty newsletter.
Coordinators of underperforming UoS are asked to prepare a short report on the UoS. The report is submitted to the Head of Discipline and AD(E).
Coordinators of UoS that are considered underperforming under the current criteria meet with the HoD and the AD(E) to discuss the report, the context, support and further actions that are required to improve the UoS.
A report is prepared by the Faculty Education Manager on the actions regarding the USE results, which is disseminated through the Faculty Education committee to all HoD, the Dean and Faculty Manager.
The AD(E), HoD and the Dean use the results to inform Faculty L&T priorities and development.
Staff are encouraged to include sections on USE results in the CUSP listings for the UoS and to discuss response to student feedback during first lecture.
**Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)** | A streamlined USE analysis and reporting system has been established by ITL in 2011 and this has enabled standardised reporting and trend analyses to be done efficiently each semester.
The Education Manager analyses the data and prepares a report for the Faculty Education Committee. It includes the overall results for the Disciplines and the Faculty for the current semester/year and previous years.
The Dean and HoD may reference USE results as part of the range of information referred to in PM&D processes.

**Explanatory Notes** | With the current ITL USE system we hope to be able to do more refined analyses to assist the Dean and HoD. |
1. Preparation

The Faculty of Arts recommends that, in addition to USE, a range of tools and strategies be used to evaluate a Unit of Study. Both informal procedures and more formal methods are recommended, and teachers are referred to the student feedback strategies outlined in the Faculty’s UoS evaluation policy as well as the webpage of the Institute for Teaching and learning (ITL). While the decision regarding these is left to the individual UOS coordinator, Faculty policy (recently redesigned) requires that every UOS be evaluated with the USE questionnaire at a minimum every third time it is taught. Units of Study that are not taught annually should be evaluated every second time they are taught. In particular instances, e.g. where a high level of student dissatisfaction with a UOS has been expressed, more frequent use of USE may be decided by the UoS coordinator or Head of School. USE schedules are put together at School level and USE orders are placed by the School offices. A clear statement of the redesigned Faculty policy on USE surveys will be placed on the Faculty’s Teaching and Learning Website. The Faculty is also trying to make staff more aware of the role of USE through the Faculty’s Teaching and Learning Committee and other key leaders in the evaluation process (e.g HOS and Chairs of Department). The evaluation procedures are generally communicated to students in the UOS outlines.

2. Consideration

Quantitative USE data and results are received by the Dean, Heads of School and individual UoS coordinators. UoS coordinators also receive students’ comments contained in the questionnaires. While the Dean oversees the whole process and makes recommendations to Heads if particular trends and issues are found across most of the surveyed UoSs, Heads of Schools monitor the statistical data for their School’s units. Heads of Schools also monitor USE results at School level, beyond the individual UOSs, and work with UoS coordinators when common problems arise (eg. student workload); They also monitor issues across particular cohorts of students (eg. first year students).

3. Action

UOS coordinators’ feedback to students on USE evaluation results is given in a variety of ways, including via departmental websites, UOS outlines and direct discussion with students in class. However Faculty recommends that in every UOS some aspect of the coordinators’ feedback be documented and systematically reported. When a high level of dissatisfaction is recorded with a particular UOS, Heads of Schools work with individual USO coordinators and Chairs of Department to identify areas of concern and develop strategic methods for improving the students’ experience of learning. The Faculty recommends that Heads of Schools treat USE survey results as confidential information, insofar as they relate to the performance of individual staff members. However aggregations of data can be made more widely available to guide and support the development of policy about the quality of learning and teaching at departmental, school and faculty level.

Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

A consistent Faculty approach and the distribution of the USE survey coordinated at the School level ensure that the process is taking place, and that reflection, reporting and feedback to students, is systematized and monitored. Faculty recommends that coordinators’ feedback for every UOS is documented, in the form of a summary of USE results, subsequent actions and communications with students, and systematically reported. The monitoring of results at the level of HOS ensures that Schools can report to the Dean on the implementation of the system and on the outcomes both at Departmental and at School level.

Explanatory Notes

In 2004 and 2005 the Teaching and Learning Committee of the Faculty of Arts conducted research across the Faculty into existing practices and attitudes to the role of USE in teaching evaluation. The new policy adopted by the Faculty in 2006 is based on the recommendations of the Teaching and Learning Committee’s report.
**Business School – UPDATED 30th May 2011**

| 1. Preparation | From Semester 2, 2011 the Business School is not using the University USE system and data will not automatically be included in the University USE Performance report. The processes adopted with the new system have not been formally reported. The information below is for the previous process. In 2003, the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) carried out a census to acquire baseline data for unit of study (UoS) evaluations (55 units in 2002; 356 in 2005). Based on this information, the Teaching & Learning Committee (now the Learning & Teaching Committee) decided every unit of study would be evaluated biennially. Interim requests for feedback would use the USE or other instruments. This information was communicated by the Dean to all staff in 2003. • The LTC Secretary now informs School Executive Officers of the process and timelines, based on EQA working group representative notification, at the same time requesting discipline Administrative Assistant help with compiling a master list of all UoS being taught, noting nonstandard units (e.g. units taught intensively or online). Outside this and the Faculty’s biennial requirement for USE for standard units, voluntary academic evaluation takes place (via the USE or other instrument), and voluntary discipline evaluation takes place (with coordinated disciplinary meetings of UoS Coordinators). • The process is communicated: To students via Blackboard: “Every second year the Faculty seeks student feedback on all its units of study. The valuable information you provide to unit coordinators is used to make improvements for future students, and these changes can be seen in your Unit of Study Outline. This semester, evaluation surveys will be handed out typically in class during weeks 13 and 14. While it may be tempting to not complete it nor give it much attention, I want to strongly encourage you to seriously complete these surveys. If all students do this, the units you enrol in next time will have the benefit of quality student feedback. Thank you, in advance, for helping our efforts to continuously improve the learning experience here in the Faculty.” • To staff via an email announcement from the Associate Dean, L&T: Student feedback is critical to efforts to continuous improvement and building a leading learning community. 2005 is the designated year for collecting feedback on a Faculty-wide basis as 2004 was voluntary. A bulk order for the USE survey forms has been placed and unit coordinators should be receiving them in the next few weeks. More info: [http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/USE](http://www.itl.usyd.edu.au/USE) • The LTC Secretary coordinates and places the faculty’s bulk order with the ITL. |
| 2. Consideration | • Individual UoS Coordinators receive their results and voluntarily respond as appropriate (e.g. for PM&D). The Faculty’s UoS outline template requires all academics to indicate how feedback is responded to in their unit. • Heads of School (HoS) receive data from ITL, and act on units receiving less than 3. The LTC receives aggregated data by discipline and school (e.g. statistics of the number/proportion of units in each band [<3, =/>3<4, etc]). The LTC also reviews the USE process each semester. |
| 3. Action | • The EQA representative: o Discusses the results with the LTC Secretary and proposes recommendations or further evaluations (e.g. a recent comparison has been made of high USE scores with teaching award nominations and the inclusion of response to feedback in UoS outlines). o Reviews benchmarks with other universities (e.g. Melbourne University – CS TO CHECK DATA). o Reports, with the assistance of the LTC Secretary, to external accreditors on the process, results and response rates. o Reports to the LTC what process other faculties and universities employ (e.g. recent discussion at LTC re upgrading trigger to 4 as a result of checking with Faculty of Vet Science.) • Further plans (with the LTC Secretary) include comparing USE and SCEQ trends. • The LTC sets benchmarks and requirements for further action on evaluation (e.g. Analysis by Econometrics is currently underway to improve analysis for first year size/discipline). • The LTC makes recommendations for improvement (e.g. nonstandard units [Intensive; online] now require special attention when placing USE orders) • Unit coordinators receiving <3 are requested to meet with their head of school and chair of discipline, are offered support (e.g. teaching grants, teaching mentors, ITL courses) and are encouraged to undertake a teaching certificate. In some cases, this may be required. Teaching mentors asked to meet with staff scoring <3 on the USE are senior academics, have a record in curriculum design and leadership in T&L, have won teaching awards, score highly on the USE, and are involved in the LTC and/or working parties. Records of actions taken as a result of USE scores are maintained by the LTC Secretary. |

**Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)**

|  | • A report on the inclusion of the ‘response to feedback’ paragraph in the outline template is produced for the LTC, and HoS are asked to respond. • A verbal report on the inclusion of the ‘response to feedback’ paragraph in the outline template was made to the Student Reference Group in October 2005. • (Draft para to put on website – same as to SRG & FEC)? • Recommendations have been made to the LTC. Revision of the 3 score trigger; Open discussion of overall response rates and percentage scores in each band; Provide summary results to FEC (the same as to the SRG). Report to national (e.g. ABDC) and international peer accreditation bodies (e.g. EQUIS, AACSB) |

**Explanatory Notes**

**Secretary**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SB: ITL** 3/11/2011
### 1. Preparation

Although students within the Faculty are enrolled in Units of Study (UOS), there are no specific UOS evaluations but instead, evaluations of each discipline or block, and related assessments. The Faculty’s Learning and Teaching Committee acknowledged that it is vital for the Faculty to conduct internal Course Evaluation where students are able to give feedback on individual Disciplines within each Theme and Cluster. The intention of this is to provide a mechanism for quality assurance in course delivery and assessment throughout the Faculty. An updated Evaluation Policy and Procedure flow-chart was approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee for adoption. This document is available on SharePoint for all staff to access. The Evaluation Policy is also available on the Dentistry course site for students.

### 2. Consideration

The Evaluation Office facilitates End of Semester online course evaluation questionnaires to capture students’ feedback. The Faculty Evaluation Officer consolidates the online raw data and distributes the findings to the Evaluation Working Party. The Faculty’s Evaluation Office in consultation with the Evaluation Working Party prepares a report for Course Directors/Year Sub-Deans.

### 3. Action

The Course Director/Year Sub-Deans will request respective academics to respond to the feedback. In consultation with the academics, the Course Director/Year Sub-Deans would propose improvement plans based on the findings and responses. A report will be prepared and delivered to students by the Course Director and Year Sub-Deans, explaining envisaged action to address the matters that had been raised. The Assessment & Evaluation Committee will prepare a report to be presented to the Learning and Teaching Committee for staff information.

### Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

The Course Directors and Year Sub Deans prepare a report for the Assessment and Evaluation Committee and the Learning and Teaching Committee of the outcomes of recommendations on aspects requiring improvement. The Themes/Clusters with poor scores will be reassessed the following year. The heads of those Themes and Clusters with low scores will be required to meet with the A/Dean (Learning and Teaching) to clarify the issues. They will be requested to provide suggestions on how the issues will be addressed. Information gathered and actions taken will also constitute an important aspect of ADC accreditation documentation and annual reports.

### Explanatory Notes

The leadership of the Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching), Chair of Assessments and Curriculum Services Manager were instrumental in introducing the evaluations policy to the Learning and Teaching Committee. Staff was ensured the raw results would be processed through channels where they would be supported in their efforts to make positive change as opposed to receiving a raw critical analysis of their performance. The final report that is issued to staff and students will include statements of issues with recommendations for improvements (e.g. unprofessional personal criticisms will not be published).

The policy is reviewed annually and careful scrutiny of evaluations will occur in 2012 due to the introduction of a new course in the faculty, Doctor of Dental Medicine (DMD).
### 1. Preparation

The Faculty L&T Committee developed our USE system which was adopted by the Faculty in 2006. The USE system requires all UoS to be evaluated through ITL over a three-year period. Faculty questions 8-11 are determined every three years by the Faculty L&T Committee. A system of communication has been devised whereby an announcement goes out early in the semester to capture all requests for early evaluation in the semester.

These early requests are put in through the web portal individually and an email is sent to ITL Student Feedback about the early evaluation requirement. Then in about Week 4 a Master USE List (modelled on that to be submitted to ITL) is produced having identified all UoS in the Faculty due for evaluation as per the 3 year cycle.

This Master List and a notice is distributed to staff by email and it appears in the Staff Bulletin requesting corrections and amendments. Email reminders are sent out to staff until the deadline. Staff are also able to add UoS upon request. Following the deadline the Master List is amended as per advice from staff and this is converted into a bulk order and sent to ITL via the web site in Week 7.

### 2. Consideration

The Associate Dean L&T is sent the numerical data. The Project Manager L&T has access to the reporting portal. The Project Manager L&T produces different levels of reports and uses a spreadsheet devised in 2010 to identify high performing and under performing UoS, aggregate results and do trend analyses going back to 2006.

A detailed report is sent to the Dean and Associate Dean L&T. A summary aggregated report and trend analysis is sent to the Faculty Management Committee and L&T Committee.

The L&T Committee discusses the results and the implications of underperforming items and determines actions at a Faculty level. The Faculty policy and criteria have changed from examining means to looking at levels of agreement:

- UoS that receive 10 or more items that are >70% agreement are considered commendable.
- UoS that receive 3 or more items that have <50% agreement are considered to require remedial action.

### 3. Action

All UoS Coordinators of UoS that are considered commendable under the current criteria receive a joint letter of congratulations from the Dean and Associate Dean L&T.

All UoS Coordinators of UoS that are underperforming under the current criteria meet with the Associate Dan L&T to discuss the context, support and further actions that are required to improve the UoS.

The Faculty has a standardised UoS Outline system (SUMO) that includes a section for staff to fill in about the ways the UoS is being developed in response to student evaluation and feedback.

Actions regarding the USE results are disseminated through Faculty L&T committee to other areas including other Associate Deans, Program Directors, etc.

The Associate Dean L&T uses the results to inform Faculty L&T priorities and development.

### Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

- A streamlined USE analyses and reporting system has been established in 2010 and this has enabled standardised reporting and trend analyses to be done efficiently each semester.
- This is working well and has helped to better inform relevant Faculty Committees including the L&T Committee about where we are in relation to the benchmarks set.

### Explanatory Notes

The L&T Policy and processes have been amended and have been made less managerial and more developmental. This has contributed to greater acceptance from staffs, who now embrace the student evaluation processes. With our current system we hope to be able to do more refined analyses to assist Program Directors. Some initial work with this was undertaken in 2010.
### Preparation
- The Faculty L&T Committee discusses Quality Assurance (QA) and makes recommendations to the Dean.
- USE is just one aspect of the QA process. The Faculty L&T Committee also monitors the CEQ and SCEQ surveys; the Schools organize and monitor student-staff liaison meetings and mid-semester surveys.
- The current Faculty-wide USE-based QA system was introduced in 2001 and is well established. All UoS are surveyed every semester. The USE order is placed centrally by the Faculty administration.

### Consideration
The Faculty L&T Committee has set the following **minimum standard**:
1. **mean score on Q12 (overall satisfaction) should be at least 3.5**
2. response rate should be at least 30%
3. failure rate should be less than 30%
   - If any of these conditions is not satisfied, the UoS coordinators are asked to prepare a short report as described next.

### Action
The Faculty follows the following procedure:
1. Sub-Dean L&T identifies the UoS not meeting the minimum standard. The list of these potentially problematic UoS is sent to the School L&T Directors (and HoS) and the Schools are asked to prepare reports for the Faculty detailing the reasons for the issues and the changes that will be made the following year to address these issues. This typically also involves a discussion between the respective UoS coordinator and School L&T Director/HoS. Schools are also encouraged to address UoS with persistently low satisfaction.
2. Schools (L&T Directors and HoS) also receive the whole USE data and are encouraged to analyse it and present a summary to the School (trends, strong and weak areas) and also to congratulate the commendable UoS. A “commendable” UoS is typically an UoS with a mean score on Q12 of at least 4.

### Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)
- The Sub-Dean L&T analyses the data and prepares a report for the Faculty L&T Committee. It includes the overall results for the Schools and the Faculty for the current semester/year and previous years and also analysis of the effect of factors such as class size, year of study, type (postgraduate and undergraduate) on the USE results.
- The Faculty L&T Committee discusses the results. It identifies the strong and weak areas and sets priorities.
- The Faculty is still working on closing the loop by making some of the USE information available to students. We plan to do this on the Faculty webpage in a format similar to the Faculty response to the SCEQ data.
- Some lecturers are communicating the changes made in response to USE student feedback at the first lecture.
- One of the Schools (IT) holds a course evaluation meeting every semester. All UoS coordinators complete a 2-page form (what the School needs to know about the UoS and what the staff teaching the UoS next year need to know about it). The forms are archived on staff intranet and the key issues are discussed at a School meeting.

### Explanatory Notes
- The system is well established. The leadership of the Dean was important in its implementation. The focus is on supporting teaching staff in a collegial way and this is clearly communicated.
### 1. Preparation

As part of the Faculty of Health Sciences "Learning Revolution" the steering committee decided that USE evaluations would be conducted across the Faculty for all units for a 2-3 year period. These USE results would be used as evidence for the impact of the Learning Revolution. This occurred in 2009 and 2010. We are continuing with this in 2011 but expect to have a new teaching evaluation policy in place for 2012, that includes yearly evaluation of units in some form and compulsory USE evaluation every 3 years.

Program administrators for each course contact all UOS coordinators and clarify whether they would prefer an on-line or hard copy USE evaluation for their UOS. The program administrators then place a bulk order for the course.

### 2. Consideration

The Associate Deans Learning and Teaching receive the individual USE results for all units. The Faculty strategic analyst in the past has prepared reports for each course and the Faculty. The data for each course is shared with the relevant Course Director. **Units are benchmarked against the Faculty and course average.**

The Learning and Teaching committee review the Faculty results and highlight Faculty wide learning and teaching issues and make recommendations regarding how these can be addressed.

### 3. Action

The names of the UG UOS coordinators of the 10 highest scoring units in the Faculty are published in the Faculty bulletin. Results are also used to identify staff who could potentially be supported to apply for teaching awards and to take on leadership roles in learning and teaching.

In each semester for each course the lowest performing 1 or 2 units are identified, an improvement action plan is designed by the Course Director and UOS coordinator and shared with the A/Dean. Improvement action plans include identification of resources needed to improve the unit eg elearning support.

The Associate Deans Learning and Teaching monitor the Faculty performance using the following standards:

- Units with more than 80% agreement on USE item 12 will be commended for their excellence.
- Units with more than 20% disagreement on USE item 12 will be offered support.

Each UoS outline includes a paragraph about the ways the unit has developed in response to feedback.

### Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

A report for each semester is prepared for the Dean and L and T committee. The report is also discussed by the UG and PG Course Directors committees. Reports always contain a comparison to previous semesters for each unit when possible and the course and faculty as a whole.

Course Directors are responsible for ensuring that USEs are conducted.

USE results are part of the Faculty’s strategic score card.

### Explanatory Notes

The culture has shifted in our Faculty such that all USE data is now viewed by the Associate Dean and Course Directors. Problematic units are identified and a team approach is taken to eliciting and developing ideas for improvement. Units with high levels of student satisfaction are also identified and celebrated. This process has also allowed us to focus our efforts in terms of learning and teaching reform on a Faculty wide basis.
## Law UPDATED 17th October 2011

### 1. Preparation

A meeting was held with the Pro Dean, the Assoc Dean (L&T) and the Assoc Dean (Curriculum Development) to confirm how units would be selected for evaluation. Units will be evaluated through the USE at least every three years but generally more frequently. Units to be evaluated include new units, units that have a new coordinator, units where significant changes have been made since previous years and units where problems have been identified from previous USE. All new staff are informed at the Induction about the frequency of USE and how results are used. Each semester the Executive Assistant to the Dean sends out an email indicating those units scheduled for evaluation. This gives coordinators of Units of Study not on the initial list the opportunity to request to be added. The Executive Assistant ultimately places the order. The Faculty specific questions are reviewed annually by the Assoc Dean (L&T).

### 2. Consideration

The quantitative data reports are received by the relevant lecturer, the Dean, the Pro Dean and the Associate Dean (L&T). The Pro Dean may consider such reports as part of staff management, with particular attention to new and casual staff. At the moment, at the Law School we do not use the USE results in a prescriptive way (that is, having benchmark standards) but rather the Pro Dean may refer to USE results in the context of general staff management and mentoring. We would however consider developing a set of standards based on University-wide practice if there is evidence of the effectiveness of this approach.

### 3. Action

The Pro Dean may request a meeting with a staff member who receives a low rating to discuss the feedback. The Unit of Study coordinators will also meet with members of the teaching team to discuss and compare results and determine any relevant adjustments.

### Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

The results from the USE are compared with feedback from other sources such as the SCEQ in identifying strengths as well as issues needing attention at a Faculty level. A report comparing Faculty USE results from 2009 and 2010 was prepared (highlighting any trends in responses) and presented to the Dean’s Executive Committee.

### Explanatory Notes

The USE is looked upon as a positive process that provides individual teachers and unit coordinators with constructive feedback. The data is often used by staff in their PM&D, teaching award application and promotion applications. Academics also sometime employ mid-semester surveys specific to their unit. There is some concern regarding the low response rate for the USE and that we may be over-surveying.

---

## Sydney Medical School UPDATED 14TH October 2011

### Part 1 Sydney Medical Program

#### 1. Preparation

While the Sydney Medical Program has units of study for accounting purposes, the Program is organised in discipline-based blocks of 4-10 weeks’ duration, and evaluation is focused on the delivery and content of the blocks rather than units of study. Several different modes of evaluation are used. These include web-based feedback on individual lectures, feedback on how topics were delivered, and feedback on individual lecturers and tutors; specific surveys to evaluate individual blocks; specific surveys to evaluate entire academic years; and the analysis of assessment data to determine whether education target requirements are being met.

#### 2. Consideration

Feedback on individual teaching sessions, delivery of topics, lecturers and tutors is continuously reviewed by the academics responsible for overseeing each stage of the Medical Program. The Dean and the Chair of the Medical Program have regular meetings with student representatives and ad hoc meetings with individual students who wish to raise concerns (these ad hoc meetings occur frequently). Feedback on each block is reviewed informally each year and formally about once every two years by the academics responsible for organising and delivering the block, in the presence of student representatives (who contribute actively) and interested lecturers and tutors. Teaching staff and visiting lecturers and tutors have web-based access to feedback (due to a change...
in the web-based services, this was interrupted in 2011 but will resume by the beginning of the 2012 academic year). An Evaluation Committee considers the findings from the specific surveys listed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The academics overseeing each block and each stage of the Medical Program are responsible for ensuring that the feedback loop is closed, i.e. that the results from the evaluation initiatives listed above are incorporated in the subsequent cycle of the Program. The Chair of the Program is responsible for ensuring that immediate action is taken to respond to feedback that affects the current cycle of the Program. In their regular meetings with student representatives, the Dean and the Chair of the Program provide information on responses to feedback, and where relevant, bulletins are broadcast to the student body informing them of action taken. Staff responsible for Medical Program evaluation have meetings with those responsible for individual blocks and/or curriculum delivery at individual sites to discuss findings from surveys and identify areas of improvement. The Dean and the Chair of the Program acknowledge outstanding teaching by writing to individual teachers or speaking to them personally. The Dean awards prizes for outstanding teaching. The Chair of the Program or the academic responsible for the relevant stage counsels teaching staff who perform poorly. Persistent poor performance or unreliability leads to a search for alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Medical School is currently considering whether the project-based evaluation activities can be made more efficient, and is attempting to streamline the web-based feedback. The Sydney Medical Program is required to report on curriculum delivery to the Australian Medical Council on a regular basis, and the AMC reviews evaluation activities in some detail. Thus external standards are applied. The 2011 report to the AMC resulted in re-accreditation of the Medical Program to the end of 2014, and a further progress report is to be submitted in 2012. The AMC will conduct a full and detailed review of all aspects of the Program in 2014 with a view to ongoing accreditation. The AMC has recently been given statutory powers for the accreditation of medical schools to award registrable medical degrees, under the auspices of the Australian Health Professionals Registration Agency and the Medical Board of Australia. Student performance is compared across some eight Australian medical schools on a subset of standardised examination questions – an initiative of Sydney Medical School. This provides an indirect method of benchmarking the adequacy of learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to remember that a very large number of visiting lecturers and tutors contribute to the delivery of the Medical Program on campus, at eight major Clinical School sites, at approximately 12 major satellite sites and in some 150 community-based clinical settings across (and indeed beyond) NSW. Approximately 80% of the people who teach in the Medical Program are not employed by the University of Sydney, and the majority of these people teach for us on a pro bono basis in accordance with Hippocratic tradition. The scale, complexity and nature of the medical teaching operation inevitably influence the types of evaluation that can be undertaken and the types of action that can be taken on the evaluation findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2 Postgraduate Coursework**

There is wide variation in evaluation practices across post-graduate coursework programs and schools. In some case the USE is used with or without modification or supplementation. For example, in Sexual Health courses, USE is requested for all Units of Study. The data generated from these are sent through to course coordinators. However, for face-to-face subjects the USE questionnaire is not tailored enough; students are asked in addition to complete a separate questionnaire that is a lot more detailed and specific than the USE. Once received, the feedback is reviewed and discussed at a meeting with the course coordinator and the individual uos coordinator so as to ensure any necessary modifications are made. Currently, there is discussion around combining the content from the USE and the supplementary survey and administering this via Limesurvey. Student feedback is taken on board the students’ feedback and this is very much considered in relation to the ongoing planning of each Unit of Study. For UG and PG courses in Ophthalmology, USEs have been implemented for the first time in Semester 2, 2011; it is planned to implement them in future if they provide useful data. Previous online surveys received low response rates. Finally, for Pain Management:
At the course level we developed a short 15 question online unit of study evaluation, based around the USE evaluation and other ITL evaluation questionnaires (Note: we have been thinking about replacing this evaluation form with the USE form – however the Faculty has not yet reached consensus about the Faculty based questions). Students are asked to evaluate their learning experience at completion of each unit of study.

At the course level the UoS evaluation forms are collected by the Administrative Officer. The data is collected through the central university LMS. To date the response rate has been between 5-30% for each unit, despite encouragement from teaching staff to complete the form. The poor response rate is one of the reasons consideration is being given to replace this system with USE.

At the course level any specific student feedback (+ve or –ve) is communicated to the teachers by the Course Co-ordinator. Some aspects of the course have been changed on the basis of this feedback. Fortunately the feedback to date has been overwhelmingly positive. The education team work with teachers to ensure changes are made, if and when appropriate.

At the course level we have just completed the course review, which provided a comprehensive picture of the course and the improvements that have been made over time. The outcomes of the UoS evaluations, a separate student and tutor survey were incorporated into this review.

Our course is online and delivered by staff primarily based at the Northern Clinical School and RNSH. This distance from the main campus, coupled with the origins of the course (developed largely by clinical staff), at times has been challenging and opportunities to influence central decisions has not always been easy.

In some cases the USE is not used. For example, for the Master of Medicine (Paediatrics), a fully online course, the coordinator reviews the success or otherwise of the units with the main facilitator at the end of each semester, with the aim of identifying student achievement of objectives, successful activities and quality written assignments. Biennially, units are reviewed for currency and relevance. Attempts to run evaluations with students have led to unacceptably low response rates, and there are no comparable courses for benchmarking. The coordinator is actively seeking a more effective means of evaluation. The Brain and Mind Research Institute uses a custom-designed form for unit evaluation, to provide more detail than the USE offers to assist with course improvement; it is completed face to face to ensure higher response rates. The forms are collated and summarised and then passed on to the curriculum development team and the Unit of study coordinator to discuss and implement any changes to the unit of study for the next year. The Master in Genetic Counselling, which started in 2011, has a small cohort (capped at 10 students) and the USE is not currently used. Student feedback is considered very important to the success of the program and currently includes evaluation of individual lectures (RR 70-80%, results fed back to lecturers who welcome this input), more detailed end-of-semester surveys for the overall program and the clinical practice UOS and round-table discussions focused on improving course practices at the end of semester 1 2011 which were very informative. Numbers in Medical Humanities coursework degrees do not allow for meaningful statistics and an alternative form is used which can be streamlined for each class (and so guest lecturers can be rated by name for example); changes are always made resulting from formal feedback and (considerable) oral feedback from students. Lecturers always read and discuss the evaluations.

Finally in Public Health: Every unit of study offered by the School of Public Health is evaluated annually using either an in-house evaluation survey or a more extensive online survey for fully online units. The results are discussed within each program, areas of excellence and areas needing work are identified, with excellence defined as at least 80% ‘good’ or ‘excellent’ on a 5-point Likert Scale across all aspects and/or positive free text comments from students, and conversely for areas needing work. Program results are presented and debated at an annual L&T plenary. Individual unit coordinators initiate additional evaluations, sometimes extensive, for example of tutors, of individual lectures or of T&L initiatives such as SCORPIOS, while the School as a whole undertakes extensive evaluations around topics of concern, for example the experience of mid-year starters, impact of IELTS scores on progress, expectations and experiences of online discussions and staff/student grade perceptions. The most significant issues identified for the School as a whole are addressed during the following year by the School’s Teaching and Learning committee; issues relating to individual programs are addressed at program level. Plans for triennial evaluation of all units of study have been approved by the School’s Academic Board; as part of this process, it is hoped to gain support for the use of USEs.
## Preparation

The faculty L&T c’tee discussed how we would fulfill the University requirements. We consulted with staff about the processes they used and looked at what other faculties were doing. The c’tee formulated the faculty policy/statement and provided leadership in ensuring implementation. We involved UoS coordinators in drawing up a schedule of evaluation through consultation with program coordinators. At SNS, all new UOS or UOS which have undergone significant change will initially be evaluated for 2 consecutive years, then once every two years (unless cause for annual evaluation). The UOS coordinators are contacted by L&T Admin towards the end of semester and advised that USE’s will be requested in a bulk order for units which have been identified as requiring an evaluation (as outlined above). Coordinators are given the opportunity to request their evaluations individually (paper or electronic versions) or request an evaluation voluntarily if their unit has not been identified as requiring one this semester.

## Consideration

The teaching and learning committee receives the summary report and spreadsheet on the Dean’s behalf. We identify optimal evaluation by students and target those where student feedback suggest we should undertake enquiry and development. The c’tee determines benchmarks – currently those units that achieve a mean greater than 4 or above (out of 5) are considered to be performing well. Most units range between 3.5 and 4 whilst those units with a mean of 3.5 (or lower) are reviewed.

At the end of each semester, unit coordinators are invited to reflect on their unit of study through a report template which they are required to respond to the following prompts:

- Content and delivery of the revised curriculum framework (for new units from 2010),
- assessment tasks and strategy,
- student results and grades (distribution),
- comment on their contextualisation of the USE data, and
- personal reflections on the unit highlighted proposed changes for the next iteration/delivery.

The report is submitted to the L&T c’tee for review and recommendations to enable a more complete picture of the delivery of the unit and across units for the degree. These reports form the basis of presentations by unit coordinators at the annual Closing the Loop Day.

## Action

Optimal units are strongly encouraged to submit an application for a Faculty Teaching Award. Those with lower scores are invited to meet with the A/Dean L&T and the program director to contextualise and discuss strategies for improvement. They are also supported through the opportunity to work with a peer, or to come to a group meeting with the T&L C’tee and/or seek assistance from the Quality Advisor regarding pedagogy and delivery. Each UoS outline includes a paragraph about the ways the unit has modified or enhanced in response to feedback from previous students. A feedback report is currently being developed for the SNS website which will be accessible to students, indicating changes made to UOS based on student feedback via the USE process.

## Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)

Incorporated into the SNS framework for Quality, revised and new courses will be monitored through a curriculum implementation and evaluation protocol that combines data from a variety of sources to build a map of the student experience and stakeholder satisfaction. This protocol includes the use of Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ), the university of Sydney Unit of Study Evaluation Questionnaire (USE), Faculty annual online surveys and student representative groups and feedback loops, peer review, as well as analysis of annual progression, retention and attrition rates. Specifically the focus will be on student learning, teaching improvement, evidence-based decision making, use of technology, collaborative networks and responsive action. Further analysis of USE data as well as thematic analysis on open response questions will be undertaken to set benchmarks, particularly for USE scores. Focus groups and interviews with stakeholders will be undertaken where necessary to gather more evidence on quality mechanisms and processes at the staff-student interface.

This protocol is developed and implemented during the first two years of the new program with feedback loops to the Program Director and teaching teams, identification of areas for improvement and supportive scholarship around this new initiative. The evaluation protocol will then be administered over two yearly cycles unless a need becomes evident to undertake it more regularly. The overall results and outcomes of evaluation will be regularly presented to the Learning & Teaching Committee and the Faculty Board for discussion.
The L&T c’tee reviews all SNS USE data in the form of graphs each session as well as the individual reports received from each unit coordinator. The reports and the presentations at the Closing the Loop Seminar are considered in terms of overall performance and any overall faculty issues such as teaching spaces / resources etc are considered. The T&L C’tee has oversight for ensuring that planned improvements are implemented and that units with lower scores are scheduled for re-surveying the following year to monitor the impact of such changes.

**Explanatory Notes**

Over the past three years SNS has embedded quality with strategy to ensure that all strategic initiatives imbued quality and that quality conversations occur through formal and informal channels, for example, in meetings and committees as well as ad hoc conversations in corridors. We aimed to build a culture and context that supports notions of quality within cycles of quality improvement through self-reflection, giving and receiving feedback with peers and the use of several data points. Our culture encourages and rests upon participation and multiples perspectives prior to decision-making. Two examples highlight this. Firstly, refinement of the peer review process for units of study is an ongoing conversation where the faculty has looked to other faculties using web-based databases to support such functions. Secondly, all new academic and professional staff are briefed on the quality model and governance framework and invited to participate in quality activities across semesters.

---

**Pharmacy UPDATED 4th May 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Preparation</th>
<th>USE are ordered by the A/D (L&amp;T) but staff who have implemented changes and wish to evaluate the UoS more frequently than every 3 years are free to order a USE survey themselves. In 2006 all UoS in the Faculty were evaluated in an attempt to get baseline data after the change to 6CP standardization. Now that baseline data has been established, the 3 year cycle has been re-established.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Consideration</td>
<td>The summary report and spread sheet are received by the Dean, and Associate Dean (L&amp;T).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Action</td>
<td>Coordinators of UoS with low percentage agreements are invited to discuss possible problems and potential solutions with A/D (L&amp;T) and the relevant year coordinator. Each UoS outline includes a paragraph about the ways the unit has developed in response to feedback. Changes introduced in the UoS from feedback received the previous year are also given in introductory lectures at the start of semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)</td>
<td>The A/D (L&amp;T) and year coordinator monitor that planned changes happen and that units with poor scores are scheduled for re-surveying the following year. The A/D (L&amp;T) also prepares a summary report giving results and actions for The Dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Preparation | **How is unit of study evaluation instigated?** Within Schools  
**Who decides what system will be used?** Individual Lecturers in consultation with their. Head of School or Teaching Committee  
**How is the plan for evaluation communicated to staff and students?** Currently Under Consideration by Faculty  
Learning and teaching Committee  
**How is a USE order placed (if using the USE)?** Blanket order of forms for Faculty placed with ITL by Assoc Dean and then individual UoS coordinators request surveys as required |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Consideration</td>
<td>Generally considered by Heads of Schools and dealt with by the Schools. ITL collected USE results examined and considered by the Dean and Dean’s delegate and compared to SCEQ results Trends and results reported to faculty Learning and teaching committee. New procedures for USE evaluation are currently being developed by a sub-group of the Faculty Learning and Teaching committee for consideration by the Dean and Heads of School in Semester 1 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Action | **How are improvements planned, and supported?** How are successes celebrated? How are students informed about the actions taken in response to their feedback? How is a record of these actions maintained? How are HOS/ faculty level issues responded to? Currently undertaken at the level of Schools within the Faculty of Science with reports as required to the Dean  
New procedures for USE consideration similar to those outlined in the example are currently being developed by a subgroup of the Faculty Learning and Teaching committee for consideration by the Dean and Heads of School in Semester 1 2006. It is envisioned that these will be implemented progressively over the coming semesters after an appropriate period allowing consultation and comment by schools within the Faculty. |
| Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3) | How can the faculty show that these processes are happening and that they are leading to improvements?  
How does the Department / School / faculty report upwards about the implementation of the system for the Evaluation of units of study and the outcomes of the evaluation? Currently undertaken at the level of Schools within the Faculty of Science New procedures similar to those outlined in the example are currently being developed by a sub-group of the Faculty Learning and Teaching committee for consideration by the Dean and Heads of School in Semester 1 2006. It is envisioned that these will be implemented progressively over the coming semesters after an appropriate period allowing consultation and comment by schools within the Faculty. |
<p>| Explanatory Notes | Much of the day-to-day operation of the Faculty is more appropriately handled at the level of the school due to the diversity of disciplines and their specific needs. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney College of the Arts – UPDATED 17th October 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL and T in consultation with the student admin team draws up an 18 month schedule that incorporates all academic courses • Schedule approved by faculty L and T committee • Yearly and semester schedules are emailed to all staff from student admin • Staff are able to request USE at anytime in addition to the schedule • All USE orders placed and co-ordinated by faculty administrative assistant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USE results circulated to unit of study coordinators from ADL and T, BVA director disseminates the qualitative feedback. Reports on progress made to the senior management team for discussion around potential strategy for faculty action • Report on USEs presented by Associate Dean to SCA learning and teaching committee • USE summary data used for strategic planning and evaluation. Results and analysis of USEs presented by ADL and T to faculty annual staff development day in the context of agreed action strategy. Units with more than 50% agreement on USE item 12 will be commended for their excellence. Units with more than 50% disagreement on (any / all / some) USE items will be offered support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful units acknowledged by Dean during the last Board meeting of the Year. Coordinators of any underperforming units of study will be encouraged to review such units of study and support will be provided to make changes where possible or necessary. These units of study will be re evaluated at the end of the following semester, as a way of monitoring improvement. Mentors for these units will be from ADL and T and or BVA Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to ADL and T by BVA director and Unit coordinators on development of initiatives to address issues around scores that are under expected levels. The ADL and T recognises broader issues that can be strategically improved. These areas are included in operational plan for L and T at SCA L and T committee review progress on the QA process. Reporting to Deans senior management team on each cycle from ADL and T of USER results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Unit of Study Evaluations were carried out in a more systematic way from the first semester 2011 onwards. One third of the faculties units will be surveyed over 3 semesters. From 2012 Units that perform well will be acknowledged in unit outlines. Staff will be asked to report on results and any initiatives for improvement agreed to in commencing units of study in the following semester. Faculty summary reports published in Deans Newsletter and Student newsletter from 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney Conservatorium of Music – UPDATED 13th October 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching draws up a 3 year schedule that incorporates all academic courses and major performance courses. • Schedule presented to faculty Learning and Teaching Committee for comment and approval • Yearly and semester schedules are advertised in the faculty bulletin • All staff are also invited to request, where appropriate, an evaluation not provided in the schedule • All USE orders placed and co-ordinated by faculty administrative assistant in consultation with the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching • Students shown specially prepared overhead re the purpose and importance of USEs before completing each set of evaluations • A SCM specific teacher evaluation form has been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consideration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USE results circulated to unit of study coordinators, associate dean, learning and teaching and dean. • Report on USEs presented by Associate Dean to faculty learning and teaching committee • Report of semester’s USEs written by Associate Dean (L&amp;T) and circulated through faculty committees. Emphasis on celebrating success. Also items on such topics as interpreting the USEs • Discussion of USEs presented by Associate Dean (L&amp;T) to faculty annual Teaching Day and in specific development fora. No standard or benchmark is applied to USE presently as each individual USE report is scrutinised by the ADLT. In addition to the USE the SCM will be using a new performance oriented survey developed with the ITL in semester 2 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members of the L&amp;T ctte determine areas of action. These areas are disseminated to faculty and students using the faculty bulletin and the student general email notice. • Staff also encouraged to report on USEs to students in first lectures in units of study • Associate Dean (L&amp;T) discusses any disappointing USEs with chair of relevant unit with particular emphasis on strategies for improvement. Associate Dean and unit chair mentor staff as appropriate • Assoc Dean (L&amp;T) provides short talk at Con O-Day on role of USE and student feedback in assuring quality in Conservatorium learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public reporting facilities (eg. Teaching Day, Learning and World of Academic Work seminar series) provide a level of transparency re operation of processes • Reporting to Associate Dean L&amp;T by unit of study coordinators re responses to USE • Continual review by Learning and Teaching Committee of ways of improving reportage and processes associated with USEs. USE summary data used for strategic planning and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanatory Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively small proportion of full-time academic and performance teaching staff in faculty mean that Associate Dean and L&amp;T Committee central to ongoing implementation and review of USE processes. • Highly fragmented and casualised staff also encouraged use of mediums such as teaching days and newsletters to advertise USE processes and outcomes. Performance Teaching staff encouraged to use our internal evaluation system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veterinary Science – as at 2007

1. Preparation
- Current policy has been in place since 2001. • Designated staff member draws up 3 year schedule that includes all Units of Study (UoS) in both undergraduate and pg coursework degrees. • All UoS are reviewed every 3 years unless Overall Satisfaction score is <3 (then reviewed annually), if students or staff request review, or if major changes occur in staffing or UoS curriculum. • Schedule approved annually by Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC). • Semester schedules are sent to all UoS coordinators approximately mid-semester so they are aware of upcoming reviews. • Designated staff member places USE orders and co-ordinates USE process, including use of overhead to explain to students reason and outcomes of USE process. • Continuing to use ITL USE surveys. Faculty helped develop new clinical teaching surveys to enable Year 5 UoS to be included in review process.

2. Consideration
- USE numerical results and open responses received by UoS coordinators and summary of numerical results for Semester USEs circulated to AD L&T, all L&T Subcommittees and Dean. • Results discussed by LTC committee at specific meeting designated for review of USE results. Since 2001 member of ITL invited to participate in meeting and advise. • Summary of Results may be included in L&T report for Faculty Meetings (along with SCEQ and CEQ data), with emphasis on successes. New structure to Faculty LTC since 2006 with 5 Sub Committees and SubDeans – each SubCommittee reviews USE results for courses which they administer.

3. Action
- Since 2001, all UoS coordinators required to write Report on USE results which includes summary of numerical data, student’s comments on best and worst features, grades achieved, changes planned to improve UoS etc. • Reports sent to Faculty LTC for review (in future will be sent to SubCommittees) • Staff encouraged to include section on USE results in UoS Handbooks and to discuss response to student feedback during first lecture. • AD L&T outlined USEs with Year 1 during Orientation with emphasis on outcomes of feedback • New system of review implemented in 2006 whereby Year Groups of teachers (including all teachers not just UoS coordinators) will review learning and teaching activities each semester and include discussion of USE results. Aim of this program is to encourage stronger peer review, sharing of successful teaching strategies and collegial approach to improving quality of L&T within the Faculty.

Quality Assurance of Process (1 2 3)
- Numerical data for USE results are widely distributed throughout the Faculty (including name of UoS co-ordinator) and are discussed at length in L&T committees. Comparisons over time are encouraged to determine trends, particularly in specific areas e.g. assessment, feedback, workload. • If ongoing area of concern (e.g. assessment, individual Units of Study) workshops are organized to address specific issues. • Public reporting of data at Faculty meetings, in Faculty newsletters etc. Accreditation procedures (national and international) require reporting on Outcomes Assessment, including Quality Assurance of learning and teaching processes. These accreditation visits occur approximately 2-3 years and therefore data collection, analysis and review must be ongoing!

Explanatory Notes
- Increased emphasis on quality of learning and teaching and responding to student feedback has been in place in the Faculty since 2001 and has resulted in significant improvements in USE, SCEQ and CEQ scores. • This process has been assisted by strong support from Dean and Faculty Executive, by an open and transparent process and by leadership from the L&T committee. • In addition, requirement of all new staff (and some old staff) to undertake Grad Cert has helped emphasis importance of teaching in Faculty. • Successes with national and international accreditation and SCEQ and CEQ results have buoyed staff and helped encouraged ongoing culture of high quality teaching. • Outcomes disseminated through scholarly publications, talks. New process of Year Group (peer) reviews and improvements to Teaching Awards in Faculty will hopefully ensure ongoing improvements.