

Evaluation, Review & Other Feedback

First Produced:	8/87	Authorisation:	Academic Board
Current Version:	31/07/08	Officer Responsible:	Director, Academic Director, HR Staff Development
Past Revisions:	4/91 1/6/94 15/10/98 22/2/01		
Review Cycle:	5 year cycle		
Applies From:	Immediately		

Major changes/additions since the last version was approved are indicated by a vertical line in the left hand margin.

1 Introduction

1.1 Policy Statement

Ara Institute of Canterbury¹ is committed to maintaining effective teaching practice, support services and administrative processes that facilitate high quality learning. Information that helps maintain internal and external standards, as well as identify ways to improve, is collected on a regular basis according to a standard set of procedures. All evaluation, review and other feedback processes carried out by faculties, divisions and management are consistent with the policies and procedures developed by the Academic Board and Management Team. Ara is a publicly accountable institution and therefore communicates the results of evaluations, reviews and other feedback, as appropriate, to students, staff, the wider community and other stakeholders.

1.2 Application of Policy

- a This policy applies to all evaluations, reviews and other feedback processes conducted at or by Ara, except formal reviews carried out by the Human Resources Division from time to time (refer HR policies).
- b This policy relates primarily to ITPNZ Academic Quality Standards: 2 Development and Review of Qualifications and Educational Programmes; 4 Staff Selection, Appraisal and Development; and 7 Programme Delivery.

1.3 Formal Delegations & Variation to Policy

Responsibilities, authorities and delegations are as per the job description of senior managers and relevant terms of reference. Refer also to the policies, *Code of Professional Practice* and *Quality Management at Ara*.

1.4 Definitions

- a. **Evaluation:** Any activity (formal or informal) undertaken to obtain information about the effectiveness of a particular aspect of our work, at a particular point in time and from a particular perspective/s (eg students, employers, staff). The purpose of evaluation is to discover what is being done well and what can be improved.
- b. **Review:** A more formal approach to evaluation, undertaken to obtain information about the effectiveness of an identified programme, support service or process, usually in more depth and over a longer period of time (e.g. since the last review). The purpose of a review is to make sound judgements and decisions about the improvement, continuation

¹ From herein referred to as Ara

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

or other aspects of what is being reviewed.

- a. **Appraisal:** A systematic summative evaluation of a staff member's performance against a job description and/or stated objectives or standards.
- b. **Course:** The smallest component of tuition delivery in which a student usually can be enrolled, consisting of defined learning outcomes and requirements.
- c. **Programme:** One or more courses, usually leading to a qualification, which has been approved by the Academic Board for delivery and is described in terms of total credit value and level.
- d. **SGID (Small Group Instructional Diagnosis):** A method of collecting student feedback, developed at the University of Washington and used at Ara since 1985. SGIDs are conducted by trained facilitators at the request of an individual staff member or group and is usually used for developmental/formative purposes.

<p>Related Ara Procedures and Forms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Teaching (standard evaluation form) • Programme Approval Guidelines ("yellow book") • Student Experience and First Impressions Survey forms 	<p>Related Ara Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APP301 Student Rights and Responsibilities • APP304 Academic Misconduct • APP505 Assessment • APP603 Design, Development and Approval of Programmes • CPP112 Quality Management at CPIT • CPP208 Resolving Staff Performance or Conduct Issues • CPP211 Code of Professional Practice • CPP212 Annual Appraisal
<p>Related Legislation or Other Documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Global Student Surveys 	<p>Good Practice Guidelines(indicate if attached to policy or where they can be found)</p>
<p>References</p>	
<p>Notes</p> <p>The Evaluation & Review Committee of the Academic Board, in consultation with ASTE, developed the first version of this policy in 1991. It was revised extensively in 1994, with the assistance of CPSA. Further consultation with faculties, divisions and CPSA was carried out for the 1998 revision, with subsequent versions following the standard policy review process.</p> <p>2016 – new branding</p>	

2 Procedures

2.1 Purpose of Evaluations, Reviews & Other Feedback

Evaluations, reviews and other feedback can answer a variety of different questions, depending on how they are designed. All of the following are relevant to the institute's operation.

- a Are we teaching what is wanted and needed by our various stakeholders (including students)?
- b Are learning opportunities and learning environments appropriate?
- c Do students value their learning and how satisfied are they with that learning? What improvements can be made?

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

- d Are programme outcomes meeting the needs of industry, communities and other identified user groups?
- e Are the standards reached consistent with the recognised standards for the particular course, programme or service?
- f How appropriate, adequate and effective are our administrative systems and support services? How can they be improved?

2.2 Minimum Requirements for Evaluations, Reviews & Other Feedback

- a Evaluation, review and other feedback processes are designed to identify not only what can be improved, but also what is being done well.
- b All students are given the opportunity to provide formal feedback on their programme, including the quality of teaching and relevant support services, on at least an annual basis.
- c Student feedback is used in conjunction with other information about the programme and services to make improvements. Overall results are communicated to students, either globally or at programme service level, depending on the type of evaluation undertaken and what is considered feasible.
- d Centrally administered evaluation, review and other feedback processes are conducted on a prescribed basis, according to procedures set by the Academic Board and/or Management Team. This includes protocols for reporting results and monitoring action plans.
- e Evaluations, reviews and other feedback processes administered by departments or divisions are conducted according to protocols determined by the department/division, but are consistent with the requirements set out in this policy. Departments/divisions are responsible for ensuring that results are made available to those who were involved, as well as to those with the responsibility for acting on the information obtained. They also are responsible for producing and monitoring action plans arising from the evaluation/review/feedback.
- f Formal staff appraisal is carried out by people with the responsibility and training to do so, according to the policies overseen by the Human Resources Division.
- g All staff are expected to be involved in evaluations, reviews and other feedback processes (including appraisal) as part of professional practice.
- h Management is required to inform staff of any evaluation, review, appraisal or other feedback that involves or affects them and to provide information about the process being used.
- i Results of evaluation, review and other feedback processes are available for internal and external audit and other reporting purposes, as appropriate in each particular case.

2.3 Guidelines for Evaluations, Reviews & Other Feedback

a Student Feedback

Student feedback is a vital component of almost every evaluation and review, so students are involved in decisions about what, how and when feedback is collected. They are also privy to the results and decisions made, provided confidentiality of formative evaluations is acknowledged. Because of the large and varied student body, consultation usually is achieved via the Ara Students' Association and their representatives on bodies such as the Academic Board, Council, Department Boards of Studies and Programme Advisory

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

Committees.

b Evaluation of Teaching

The main reason for evaluating teaching is to provide information on what can be done to maintain or improve effectiveness of a particular teacher or group. The information obtained, therefore, needs to be specific and relevant to that teacher/group. The following guidelines cover different types of evaluations, reviews and feedback.

i Formative evaluation

The methods and timing of formative (developmental) evaluation varies according to factors such as length and level of course, background of students, size of class and experience of the teacher/s. The staff involved should make the decision about methods and timing of evaluation, in consultation with the Head of Department and/or colleague/s.

Staff have the right to keep information from formative evaluation confidential to themselves and the students involved. For maximum benefit, however, results should be discussed with a colleague, supervisor or Staff Development. When students complete an evaluation before the end of a course, at least an overall summary and indication of any changes to be made should be communicated directly to them by the staff member/s conducting the evaluation.

ii Summative evaluation

Standard procedures are used for summative (decision making) evaluation, eg probation, promotion or appraisal, and are administered by someone other than the staff member/s involved. When any consultation or survey of teaching practice are to be conducted, the teaching staff directly involved are given adequate notice of this and information on the intended process.

Although others use the results of summative evaluations for decision making, in most cases all information obtained is made available to the person/s whose teaching is being evaluated, in collated or original form depending on the need for confidentiality of responses.

iii Other feedback

Staff are required to cooperate with centrally administered feedback processes endorsed by the Academic Board or Management Team (e.g. Student Experience survey, Quality of Teaching evaluations), as well as department based evaluations that meet the standards set by either of those bodies. A copy of the centrally developed and validated instrument currently in use to collect feedback on quality of teaching is attached.

Staff can also request feedback to be collected on their behalf (eg via the SGID process), with the results usually being confidential to the staff member and students involved.

c Evaluation of Courses and Programmes

Evaluation of courses and programmes is required on a regular, prescribed basis. The primary purpose is to compare what is currently happening against stated programme/course criteria and to develop an action plan for improvement.

For formal evaluations, input is required from at least the following groups: current students, internal and external monitors, members of the Programme Advisory Committee/networks and, where possible, students who enrolled but stopped attending. In most cases, these evaluations are carried out through the use of the Student Experience survey, moderation and monitors' reports, course and programme evaluations, Programme Approval Committee reports and analysis of student achievement results.

Staff are required to cooperate with course/programme evaluations endorsed by the Academic Board or Management Team, as well as department based evaluations that meet the standards set by either of those bodies.

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

Information obtained from course/programme evaluations is available to the Academic Board and Management Team as appropriate, and used as the basis for reporting in the Ara Annual Report and the Tertiary Education Commission returns, to CPSA, accreditation panels and audit teams.

When students complete an evaluation before the end of a course, an overall summary and/or indication of any changes to be made are expected to be communicated directly to them by the staff overseeing the evaluation. The Academic Division undertakes to provide global summaries of formal surveys to students, usually via CPSA newsletters or CPSA representatives on the Academic Board.

d Review of Programmes

The main purpose of a programme review is to obtain an overall picture of the effectiveness of the programme and to assess its ongoing viability. Reviews usually use previous evaluations as the starting point and focus on a longer timeframe, usually since the date of the last review.

Programme reviews are conducted on a prescribed basis, as determined by the Academic Board and in accordance with external requirements. The Academic Board sets the internal timeframe for the review of each programme as part of its programme approval processes (usually 5 years). The Academic Board or Management Team may initiate a programme review earlier than the determined date if they consider there are reasons to warrant it.

Details are set out in the *Programme Approval guidelines* ('yellow book'), updated regularly by the Programme Approval Committee. When a programme is due for review and reapproval, the Development Centre process is re-initiated as a check of financial viability.

The Head of Department is responsible for ensuring that the reviews are completed on time and according to the stated procedures. Staff are required to co-operate with programme reviews, according to their particular role.

Information obtained from programme reviews is made available to the Academic Board, Council and Management Team as appropriate. The expected outcome is the redocumentation and reapproval of the programme, incorporating any improvements made as a result.

e Evaluation of Learning

Assessment of student learning is carried out according to the policies developed by the Academic Board, with reference to external requirements. Departments are expected to develop procedures for the implementation of these policies, including an overall assessment plan for each course/programme, formative and summative assessment methods, marking guides, internal and external moderation, methods of reporting assessment results to students and systems for recording and storing the results (see Related Policies for reference to policies covering assessment).

f Evaluation, Review and Feedback Related to Services

Evaluation, review and feedback related to the institute's services, including administrative functions, are required on a regular, prescribed basis. The main purpose is to obtain information on how well services are meeting the needs of the primary users (usually students) and to identify areas for improvement. The procedures used will vary according to the nature of the service, the number of staff involved and who the recipients of the service are. This can include formal audits (eg Audit NZ); student feedback from the Student Experience survey or other formal feedback; specially designed user feedback surveys initiated by the relevant Division; and department/division reviews, usually conducted by the HR Division or an external consultant.

Information obtained from evaluations, reviews and other feedback is reported to the Academic Board, Management Team, Council, and/or CPSA as appropriate, as well as via the Ara Annual Report, Tertiary Education Commission, accreditation panels, and audit teams.

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

Managers of administrative and support services are required to use the results to make or recommend changes within their sphere of responsibility. Staff are required to cooperate with internally and externally administered evaluations and reviews.

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.

g **Addressing Concerns Arising from Evaluations, Reviews and Other Feedback**

In most cases, the process for addressing issues arising from evaluations, reviews or other feedback process is built into the methodology itself. The Academic Director, HR Director/Manager and Staff Development are available for advice and assistance as needed.

If unexpected or major issues related to staff are identified, the steps set out in the policy, *CPP208 Resolving Staff Performance or Conduct Issues* are followed. Refer also to *APP304 Academic Misconduct* and *CPP211 Code of Professional Practice* policies.

All policies on the InfoWeb are the current version. Please check date of this hard copy before proceeding.