

University of Glasgow Policy on Course Evaluation Questionnaires

This Policy sets out the University's requirements for gathering course evaluation data from students via questionnaires. It covers the means of collecting, presenting, and responding to questionnaire data, and its use at School and institutional level.

1. Summary of the Policy

- All courses must use a course questionnaire as one of the methods to solicit course evaluation data from students.
- The minimum requirement is the verbatim inclusion of the Core Question Set, which is considered sufficient for general, routine evaluations.
- Students should be given clear instructions on how to complete the questionnaire and advised in advance as to when it will be circulated.
- For each course, the data from the completed questionnaires should be summarised in a 'Summary and Response' document (SaRD) which must be made readily available to students and discussed at Staff Student Liaison Committees (or equivalent).
- Automatic access to all data associated with individual courses is restricted; aggregated data will be more widely distributed and used for institutional purposes.
- Use of the EvaSys Course Evaluation System is required: there are aspects of this Policy that cannot be followed without its use.

2. Collecting and responding to Student Evaluations

2.1 The questionnaire

All courses must use an anonymous course evaluation questionnaire as one of the methods used to enable students to evaluate their educational experience. All questionnaires must include, *verbatim*, the Core Question Set (Appendix 1).

This core set has been devised to capture sufficient information to provide an overall assessment of the course, and to highlight any concerns. Accordingly, **the Core questions are considered sufficient for general, routine use** for evaluating all courses by questionnaire. In other (non-general, non-routine) circumstances, the course co-ordinator may extend the questionnaire by adding further questions. Various question sets tailored to suit different purposes are provided, as are principles for the design of extended questionnaires (Appendix 3).

If a course is taught in 'meaningful blocks', in which there is a clear division of different topics being taught, then it may be appropriate to formally define these blocks as 'course-blocks', and use a questionnaire at the end of each course-block.¹ This is particularly useful if a course lasts over two semesters or over a whole year.

¹ In this case, it is important that the questionnaires be kept short, preferably using only the Core Questions.

2.2 Closing the Loop

For each course, the course co-ordinator should summarise the student responses from the completed questionnaires in a 'Summary & Response' document (SaRD, Appendix 2).

SaRDs should be:

- made available as promptly as possible to the students who completed the questionnaires in order to maximise visible responsiveness by staff, and normally no later than three weeks after the survey closing date;
- raised for discussion at the next Staff-Student Liaison Committee Meeting (SSLC) (or equivalent), under a standing item on all SSLC agendas 'Discussion of Student Evaluations', which will also provide the opportunity for periodic updates on progress to be discussed;
- made available to incoming students for the next offering of the course.

Members of staff may provide (as part of the SaRD) a contextual narrative to record any particular factors that may have affected the student responses so to minimise the risk of misinterpretation.

3. The Data

While the Policy acknowledges the need for members of staff to gather individual feedback, the focus of the Policy is on course enhancement (whether taught by individuals or teams).

3.1 The survey results for each course (pdf reports created by EvaSys)

Automatic access to the results of a survey for a course (or course-block) is restricted to the course teaching staff and their line managers (or person who conducts their PDR, if this is not the line manager). This does not prohibit an individual member of staff from choosing to share their own course evaluation responses as they see fit; indeed, they are encouraged to do so to support PDR, promotion or award applications.

Access to the pdf reports associated with individual courses is restricted unless it is agreed at an appropriate School level meeting² that such data can be passed to the School L&T Convenor (or equivalent) for the purposes of course enhancement.³

3.2 Aggregated data (spreadsheets created by the Senate Office)⁴

At the end of each semester, "percentage agree" aggregations for each of the Core closed questions over Subject (based on course code), School and College (for each year level) will be produced by the Senate Office. These will be distributed to Deans of Learning and Teaching in each College for discussion at College Learning and Teaching meetings and distribution to Heads of School, and to the University Learning and Teaching Committee for discussion. This aggregated data is public, and may be distributed to all members of staff.

² Individual members of staff may choose to opt-out.

³ Note that the creation and distribution of ranked lists of courses based on the quantitative data from a collection of survey reports is against the spirit of the policy, which focuses on identifying the ways in which *all* courses can be enhanced: information that is best obtained from the qualitative data.

⁴ This process requires the use of an application created and maintained by IT Services.

A report listing all those surveys that were not included in the aggregation, and the reason for the exclusion (for example, incorrect labelling of surveys, missing questions) will be distributed to the four College Heads of Academic and Student Administration, for appropriate discussion with School EvaSys administrators.

4. Flexibility and Constraints

There is a great deal of flexibility in the Policy, in recognition that Schools or course co-ordinators might wish to implement local alternatives.

The following aspects of the Policy are not flexible:

- the use of the Core Question Set in a questionnaire administered for every course;
- the form of reporting quantitative results (median, frequency distribution, percentage agreement);
- the restricted right to automatic access to the EvaSys pdf reports;
- the production and release of SaRDs, and their discussion at SSLCs;
- the use of EvaSys.

The following are local decisions to be made by School Learning and Teaching Committees (or equivalent School Educational Committees):⁵

- the timing of delivery of surveys, and how/when to inform lecturers and students;
- the methods by which students can be encouraged to complete surveys;
- the process by which individual members of staff can request customisation of their questionnaires;
- where the School's SaRDs are to be stored so as to facilitate easy access by current and incoming students;
- how survey reports may be used by School L&T Convenors (or equivalent) for the purposes of course enhancement (if agreed by the School);
- when and how courses might need to be divided into 'meaningful blocks';
- which version of Core Q1 is most appropriate for each survey;
- how to deal with inappropriate qualitative comments made by students;
- the use of other appropriate means of evaluating courses where necessary.

Members of staff seeking evaluations particularly for the purposes of Teaching Excellence recognition or promotion on the Learning, Teaching and Scholarship track should:

- if they are the sole member of staff teaching on any course (course-block), request that the Teaching Quality Set be added to that course survey; or
- if (and only if)⁶ *all* the courses (or course-blocks) that they teach on are team taught, use other evaluation methods to gather student opinion, preferably using the questions in the Teaching Quality Set. If doing so, the specific purpose of this additional evaluation must be made clear to the students.

⁵ If there is any doubt about what aspects of the Policy may be adapted for local purposes, the Senate Office will advise.

⁶ This constraint is imposed so as to reduce the risk of over-surveying students: only members of staff seeking recognition for the purposes of Teaching Excellence recognition or promotion on the Learning, Teaching and Scholarship track and who only teach on team-taught courses should use this option.

Appendix 1: The Core Question Set

All questionnaires must include the following five questions (the Core Question Set), at the top of the questionnaire, in this order, with no interspersed questions:

CORE1a (individual teaching)	The lecturer explained things well. (Scale)
<i>or</i>	
CORE1b (team teaching)	Teaching staff explained things well. (Scale)
<i>or</i>	
CORE1c (supervision).	My project/dissertation/placement supervisor/ course coordinator was helpful. (Scale)
CORE2.	The course was intellectually stimulating. (Scale)
CORE3.	I am satisfied with the overall quality of the course. (Scale)
CORE4.	What was good about the course? (Open)
CORE5.	How could this course be improved? (Open)

CORE1c (supervision) should be adapted as appropriate for a course that only entails supervision of a piece of work, or academic co-ordination when the course comprises a wide range of activities.

Appendix 2: Template for the Summary and Response Document (SaRD), with example

Course name: *PW2033: Prospective Warehousing Policies 2, 2016/7*

Response rate: 38%

Summary of Student comments	Date comment received	Response from Academic Staff	Expected completion date (if required)	Action Owner
Positive feedback				
<i>The videos shown during the lectures were very useful</i>	<i>13/04/17</i>	<i>No action needed: they will continue in future years</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Problems highlighted				
<i>There are too many tutorial questions to finish them in the tutorial session.</i>	<i>13/04/17</i>	<i>The important questions will be highlighted in advance; students are expected to do the others in their own time</i>	<i>To be done on a weekly basis during the next academic year, from January 2018</i>	<i>Course lecturer</i>
<i>The first two weeks were boring; they covered material already covered last year</i>	<i>13/04/17</i>	<i>This material is essential for students who did not take the level 1 course. Advanced reading topics will be provided for students who wish to read ahead in these two weeks.</i>	<i>Reading topics have been identified and placed on the course Moodle page (13/05/17)</i>	<i>Course lecturer</i>
<i>The lecturer talks too fast</i>	<i>13/04/17</i>	<i>The lecturer can try to speak more slowly, and will emphasise to the class that interruptions from students who wish to ask questions are welcome.</i>	<i>To be done at the start of the course in January 2018</i>	<i>Course lecturer</i>

Context statement: *This course was offered for the first time and there were some teething problems which have been identified and will be acted upon in subsequent offerings.*

Example contextual statements

- This is a core course which contains essential contextual, but difficult, material. Experience shows that at the time it is unpopular with students, but later in their studies and careers they show greater appreciation of the content.
- There were specific issues beyond the control of the teaching staff (such as room allocation, IT facilities, library, etc.,) which significantly impacted on student satisfaction.
- A change in how topic X was delivered has resulted in a significant improvement in student evaluations over previous years.
- This is a team taught course with presentations from several internal and external contributors. The quality of presentations and engagement with students is variable. Student feedback helps inform who should be invited to contribute in subsequent years.
- The intended lead lecturer was ill and other staff stepped in to deliver the course at short notice.
- Student attendance at lectures was poor throughout the semester (approximately 25%).

Appendix 3: Extended Questionnaires

Unless otherwise stated, all questions use the scale:

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*

THE COURSE QUALITY SET

- CQ1. I understood what is expected of me in this course.
CQ2. The structure of the course helped me understand the material.
CQ3. The course encouraged me to work independently.
CQ4. Appropriate resources were provided to support my learning in this course.
CQ5. The methods of assessment allowed me to demonstrate my learning.
CQ6. The criteria used in marking have been made clear in advance.
CQ7. I have received helpful and timely feedback on my work⁷
CQ8. Compared with other courses, this course was: Engaging Dull
CQ9. Compared with other courses, this course was: Difficult Easy

THE COURSE QUALITY SUPPLEMENTARY SET

- CQS1. The seminars helped me to gain a deeper understanding of the subject.
CQS2. The practical sessions helped me to gain a deeper understanding of the subject.
CQS3. The tutorials helped me to gain a deeper understanding of the subject.
CQS4. The group-work exercises helped me to gain a deeper understanding of the subject.
CQS5. The course has helped me to give oral presentations with confidence.

THE TEACHING QUALITY SET

- TQ1. The lecturer made the subject interesting.
TQ2. The lecturer was enthusiastic about the subject.
TQ3. The lecturer was approachable.
TQ4. The lecturer gave me sufficient support with my studies when necessary.
TQ5. I have been able to contact the lecturer when I needed to.
TQ6. The lecturer gave me useful feedback on my academic work.
TQ7. The lecturer encourages student participation.
TQ8. The best part of this lecturer's teaching is ... *OPEN*
TQ9. If I were the lecturer, I would teach differently by ... *OPEN*

THE PGT SET

- PGT1. I understood what was expected of me in this course.
PGT2. The assessment requirements for this course were clear.
PGT3. I received sufficient support for my studies.
PGT4. I received sufficient feedback on my academic work.
PGT5. The number of formal contact hours allocated to this course was appropriate.
PGT6. I found this course: Difficult Easy

⁷ Revised for v2.0 the Policy, in line with changes to NSS questions.

THE EXPECTATIONS/MARKETING SET

E/M1. This course has met my expectations.

E/M2. I would recommend this course to other students.

E/M3. My experience at The University of Glasgow has met my expectations.

E/M4. I would recommend The University of Glasgow to other potential students.

E/M5. The University of Glasgow is an example of my ideal higher education institution.

THE ONLINE AND DISTANCE LEARNING SET

OL1. I did not find the technology a significant barrier to participating in the course

OL2. The course was fully accessible to me

OL3. I was provided with sufficient opportunity to interact with others

OL4. Technological support was available if required

THE AD-HOC SET

This set is deliberately empty. Questions customised for *specific, clearly identified purposes* may be added to this set.

Principles of extended questionnaire design:

- If a question set is to be included, then normally all questions in the set should be used (although questions that are *clearly inappropriate* for a particular course may be omitted). This prevents 'cherry-picking' those questions that are likely to get positive responses.
- The total number of questions in the entire questionnaire (including the core questions) should not exceed 22 unique closed questions, and four open questions.
- If the Teaching Quality Set is used, then this would normally preclude the use of the Course Quality Set (and vice versa).
- Care should be taken that questions are not duplicated.
- Data from *all* questions should be summarised in the Summary & Response Document – not just the data from the Core Question Set.

Appendix 4: Data Access

Automatic data access is restricted to those who have the means to effect change.

	Form	Created by	Made available to	Purpose
Document reporting the responses from a survey relating to a course (or course-block) taught by one lecturer (pdf report)	For each closed question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of responses and the median response a frequency distribution. Qualitative responses to open questions.	School/Institute EvaSys administrator	The lecturer (automatic access)	Personal development, reflection & enhancement, recognition
			The lecturer(s)' line manager(s) (automatic access)	PDR
			L&T Convenor (or equivalent), if agreed across the School, and with consent)	Course enhancement
Document reporting the responses from a survey relating to a course (or course-block) taught by a team (pdf report)	For each closed question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of responses and the median response a frequency distribution. Qualitative responses to open questions.	School/Institute EvaSys administrator	All lecturers on the team (automatic access)	Personal development, reflection & enhancement, recognition
			The lecturer(s)' line manager(s) (automatic access)	PDR
			L&T Convenor (or equivalent), if agreed across the School, and with consent)	Course enhancement
Summary & Response document summarizing the responses from a survey, together with action points where appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A table listing the themes (both positive and negative) emerging from the qualitative data Responses, action points and completion dates (where appropriate) 	Lecturer or course teaching team	Current students on the course; prospective students; SSLCs	Course enhancement
Narrative context for a course (part of the SaRD)	A contextual statement	Lecturer or course teaching team	Current students on the course; prospective students; SSLCs	Interpreting student responses in context
Report presenting aggregated 'percentage agreement' for each of the CORE 1-3 questions over all courses in Subjects, Schools and Colleges, at each year level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall mean "percentage agreement" score for each of the three CORE1-3 questions. Data from non-Core questions are not included. "Traffic light" indicators based on pre-defined thresholds – these are only to be used once appropriate levels have been determined by EdPSC based on evidence from previous data 	Senate Office EvaSys Administrator	Anyone, including all members of staff	Monitoring and comparing performance. Individual members of staff may wish to compare their own results with their School's mean values for the purposes of their PDR.

Appendix 5: Supplementary Information

The Background

Version 1.0 of the Policy (endorsed by the Education Policy and Strategy Committee on 12 June 2014 and approved by Senate on 2 October 2014) was implemented by several Schools in the 2014-15 session, and by all Schools from 2015-6. Version 1.1 (released in August 2016) clarified ambiguities and terminology, included responses to an external PWC audit, and was more specific in the requirements for evaluating courses taught by more than one person, and courses that cover several discrete topics.

Version 2.0 of the Policy includes revisions based on the experiences of implementation during the 2015-6 and 2016-7 academic sessions, and the views of School L&T convenors and EvaSys administrators collected during a review process conducted in February/March 2017. In particular, it:

- amends the requirements for CORE question 1, so as to clearly distinguish between courses taught by one lecturer, and courses taught by a team;
- adds a new Question Set for Online courses;
- clarifies the flexibility inherent in the Policy, identifying which decisions should be made locally;
- provides an updated 'Summary and Response Document' (SaRD) template;
- provides guidance for lecturers seeking recognition on the basis of Teaching Excellence.

The Purpose of Course Evaluation

The University identifies the main purposes of gathering course evaluation data from students as being:

- Summative:
 - to provide a snap-shot of the past, a description of how the course ran;
 - to highlight existing good practice;
 - to highlight exceptional quality that can be referred to in marketing and recruitment activities;
 - to recognise teaching as evidence for Teaching Excellence Awards or promotion.
- Formative:
 - to help identify where improvements can be made and where there are unexpected problems that need to be solved;
 - to ensure that the quality of teaching is sustained and improved;
 - to identify where teaching staff might need additional support or resources.
- To demonstrate the use of course evaluation practices across the University for the purposes of audit.

Thus, one method of gathering course evaluation data, *questionnaires* can provide teaching staff with quantitative and qualitative information to help improve their courses year on year, and with evaluation of their teaching performance as perceived by their students.

The Policy

Students should have the opportunity to evaluate each of their courses via a course questionnaire. The use of a Core Question Set for all evaluations provides a consistent experience for students and will enable the University to demonstrate that course evaluation processes are auditable and operate effectively across the institution. It will also enable the University to collect comparative data at institutional level.

The use of course questionnaires, containing the Core Question Set as a minimum, is a requirement of the University for quality management purposes. It is not intended to replace or to discourage the use of other highly effective forms of course evaluation (such as focus groups, interviews, minute papers, short in-class questions), and the continued use of these methods in parallel with the questionnaire is strongly supported. An added bonus is that these methods encourage students to engage with the evaluation process early on, thus helping them develop appropriate critical and reflective skills which will contribute to better quality subsequent course evaluations. Further information on various methods of evaluating courses can be found in the University's Code of Practice on Obtaining and Responding to Student Feedback.

However, the use of additional questionnaires outside the requirements of this Policy is strongly discouraged, since this may lead to questionnaire fatigue, and consequently a higher probability of scanty and unrepresentative data being provided by students weary of filling in surveys. A notable exception to this advice is when a member of staff *who only teaches on team-taught courses* wishes to gather data on their teaching ability, for the purposes of Teaching Excellence recognition or promotion on the Learning, Teaching and Scholarship track.

The Process

There are no specific recommendations as to when during a course the questionnaire should be administered, but, to ensure that the process is given appropriate commitment and attention, students must be told at the beginning of each course (or course-block) on what date the questionnaire will be administered.⁸ While it might be assumed that students know how to complete questionnaires, clear, explicit guidelines should be provided at the top of each questionnaire: EvaSys questionnaires automatically include instructions on completing closed questions.

The 'Summary & Response Document' (SaRD)

Giving students a summary of the data and comments that they have provided for a course is an important means of demonstrating to students that their views are taken seriously, and are being acted upon as necessary. This is also important for motivating students to complete course evaluation questionnaires, and to undertake the task seriously.

⁸ This is a recommendation from the PWC audit

Informed by both the quantitative and qualitative data, a summary of the main themes emerging from the questionnaire results should be produced as a list (including positive as well as negative points). A SaRD is simply a table that summarises the student comments, and describes, for each, what action (if any) is to be taken. If no action is proposed for an issue, then a clear and valid explanation should be given. This document can incorporate themes emerging from other evaluation methods during the course (e.g. focus groups, minute papers). The proposed actions may impact on, or have themes in common with, other courses and so sharing and discussion with colleagues is encouraged.

The Course Data

The evaluation data provided by students for a specific course can be sensitive and is therefore restricted to those who have a clear right or organisational need to access it.

Automatic access to the results of a survey for a course (or course-block) is restricted to the course teaching staff and their line managers (or person who conducts their PDR, if this is not the line manager). Thus, **automatic** release of data relating to an individual member of teaching staff is restricted to only the person in a position to influence the individual's subsequent behaviour by offering additional support, praise, encouragement for promotion application etc.⁹ Confidential access may also be given to the director of the associated programme (or equivalent) if the Head of School considers this necessary. This does not prohibit an individual member of staff from choosing to share their own course evaluation responses as they see fit; indeed, they are encouraged to do so to support PDR, promotion or award applications.

Staff responsible for operating EvaSys software will require full access to data¹⁰ within their area of responsibility for administrative purposes and are expected to treat it in a strictly confidential manner.

The following factors are identified as important when interpreting student course evaluation data:

- some students are disinclined to rate at either of the extreme ends of a rating scale
- expectations of students influence the responses they give to questions and so, for example, the manner in which a course has been marketed can have an effect
- students tend to be more positive about optional courses than compulsory courses
- in small cohorts, the opinion of one or two students can affect summary results substantially
- students may answer from a limited perspective, without sufficient knowledge to understand a wider overview of their educational experience
- difficult courses often receive lower ratings than easier ones
- courses delivered by teams tend to receive lower ratings than those delivered by an individual teacher.

⁹ Allowing quantitative information about individual members of staff to be widely available could encourage unwelcome comparison and public ranking of individual performance.

¹⁰ That is, the data stored internally in the EvaSys system.

The Aggregated Data

The results for each quantitative question will be presented using **response frequency** distribution, the **median**, and/or “**percentage agreement**” (rather than the mean).^{11 12}

Quantitative data from the results of several course questionnaires will be aggregated to produce an overview – that is, all the courses at each year level in each School. Since aggregated data does not identify individuals, it may be made available more widely through the institution and may be used to inform institutional processes, such as Annual Monitoring, Periodic Subject Review.

Only the quantitative data elicited from the Core questions (i.e. those that are asked of all courses, CORE1-3) will be aggregated, since only this data permits direct and equivalent comparison. Any aggregation of evaluation data at the School, College, or University level will:

- only include data from the three quantitative CORE questions (CORE1-3) - responses to non-Core questions will not be included;
- not include any qualitative responses;
- be based on aggregations of “percentage agreement” for each of the three questions;
- only apply “traffic-light” analysis in comparisons with benchmarks or target values once appropriate levels have been determined by EdPSC based on evidence from previous data. The use of traffic lights to inform institutional quality processes, e.g. Annual Monitoring, Periodic Subject Review, will only be developed when confidence in the measure has been established;
- only include data from EvaSys surveys associated with a correctly formed course code.

Questionnaire extension

The Core Question Set is sufficient for **general, routine** use in evaluating all courses by questionnaire.¹³ In the case of *non-general, non-routine* evaluation, the Policy permits extensions to the questionnaire by:

- defining principles for the design of extended questionnaires, and
- providing a range of optional question sets, tailored to suit different purposes.

The emphasis in the creation of extended questionnaires is the need for **additional evaluative information required for a particular purpose**, for example, questions about specific innovations introduced for the first time on the course. Since extending the basic questionnaire will result in additional effort for students, lecturers and administrative staff, there need to be clear, particular reasons for extending the questionnaire. That is, being able to say ‘*We need this specific information*

¹¹ This is the method used in the National Student Survey (NSS), which reports distribution data and percentage agreement, and is a more statistically meaningful approach than using the mean.

¹² “Quality guidelines and indicators” (as implemented in EvaSys) should not be used in the reporting of data for an individual course, individual questions, or for any overall score derived from aggregating question responses.

¹³ The required Core question set is deliberately small, since students will be required to complete an EvaSys questionnaire for all the courses that they undertake.

because ... rather than *'It would be interesting to see ...'*. Simply using questions used in previous years without a clear, positive reason for doing so is discouraged.

The design of an extended questionnaire is the responsibility of the lecturer or course team. Questions additional to the core set should not be added without prior discussion with the lecturer or course team. School Learning and Teaching Committees may wish to take a co-ordinated approach in determining which non-core questions to include in the questionnaires for all of their courses. However, this should be discussed with all course co-ordinators before going ahead.

The extended questionnaire used for a particular course should not normally be the same every year for example, after an innovation has bedded down it would be appropriate to revert to just the Core questions.

The total number of questions in the entire questionnaire (including the core questions) should not exceed 22 unique closed questions, and normally not exceed four open questions.¹⁴ If the Teaching Quality Set is used, then this would normally preclude the use of the Course Quality Set (and vice versa).¹⁵

The Question Sets

The questions sets were compiled to provide staff with standard wording on popular topics to assist in focusing the evaluation information gathered from students and to obtain meaningful results. The range and complexity of possible questions and the extent of the different topics on which questions can be asked (e.g. teaching, assessment, resources, support) is unlimited. Also, questions seemingly asking the same thing can carry different messages depending on subtle changes in wording. The Course Feedback Questionnaire Working Group (2013-2014) were careful in their choice of questions selecting from a large number of existing student evaluation questions (over 350 unique questions) collected from their own experience, from external surveys (e.g. the NSS), and from other universities' publically available evaluation instruments.

Recognition of Teaching Excellence

Previous versions of the Policy permitted data about several individual members of staff to be collected within a single survey administered for a course (or course-block). This approach has been shown to be inappropriate due to privacy concerns. As a result, the revised Policy no longer includes the requirement that individual lectures in the team be named in repetitions of the closed Core Question 1a, nor that an open question seeking evaluations of individual members of staff be included (the previous Core Question 6).

¹⁴ The balance between open and closed questions has been carefully considered, as open questions require more time and effort to respond to effectively. This is in acknowledgement of the burden on students of completing questionnaires for all their courses and the several general surveys they are asked to respond to, and to minimise any adverse effect this might have on participation rates.

¹⁵ In developing the questions sets, the Working Group noted that students often conflate their opinions of the teaching of the course and its content. The Group concluded that, in order to ensure a reliable interpretation of the data, it was important for a questionnaire to focus on one set or the other.

However, some members of staff explicitly require evaluations of their teaching ability for the purposes of providing evidence for Teaching Excellence Awards, or promotion on the Learning, Teaching and Scholarship track. In these cases, the action to be taken by the member of staff depends on the extent to which they are involved in team teaching.

- If any of the courses (or course-blocks) that the member of staff teaches on are taught solely by that member of staff, s/he should request that the Teaching Quality Set be added to that course questionnaire.
- If (and only if) *all* the courses that the member of staff teaches on are team taught (that is, s/he does not have sole responsibility for teaching any course (or course-block)), s/he should use other evaluation methods to gather student opinion, preferably using the questions in the Teaching Quality Set. Students should be clearly notified of the purpose of this additional questionnaire.

Appendix 6: Resources

EvaSys is a web-based system that offers customisable questionnaire templates for use in paper-based or online surveys. The University has purchased the required licenses to provide access to EvaSys for all University Staff. Schools using the system to issue online questionnaires can do without further cost; Schools wishing to issue paper questionnaires will need to purchase or negotiate access to a licensed EvaSys Scan Station (of which there are already several in the University). Please contact Richard Lowdon, Senate Office, for more information (Richard.Lowdon@glasgow.ac.uk).

An EvaSys Admin Forum has been established to enable users to post questions and share tips. To access this forum, you will need to sign up to the University of Glasgow section of Yammer, and request to be added to the group:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/courseevaluation/#tabs-6>

Extensive resources are available on the Course Evaluation Senate Office webpage:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/senateoffice/qea/courseevaluation/>