Collecting and using student feedback on quality and standards of learning and teaching in HE

Appendices

A report to HEFCE by the Centre for Higher Education Research and Information (Open University), NOP Research Group and SQW Ltd

Contents

Appendix

Appendix A

Invitation to tender

Purpose

1.   This document invites proposals to undertake a project to:

a.   Review current good practice by higher education institutions (HEIs) in collecting quantitative and qualitative feedback from students on the quality and standards of their higher education programmes, and using that feedback to secure improvement.

b.   Make recommendations on the design and implementation of a national survey to collect such feedback from students who have recently graduated, and publish the results.

c.   Make recommendations on how individual HE institutions can best design and implement their own internal mechanisms for:

i.   collecting quantitative and qualitative feedback data from current students; and

ii.   following up that feedback to secure improvement and address students' concerns.

2.   The project is being managed by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), in collaboration with the Quality Assurance Agency, the Standing Conference of Principals and Universities UK. The scope of the study relates to England. But the higher education funding bodies for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are represented by observers on the steering group, and will consider at a later stage what aspects of the study are relevant to them.

Background to the Project

3.   A new method is currently being developed for securing quality assurance in higher education. Consultation document 01/45 (available on the HEFCE website at www.hefce.ac.uk) was published in July 2001, jointly between HEFCE, QAA, UUK and SCOP. It set out proposals for a new quality assurance framework and method in England. An analysis of the responses to that consultation is available on the QAA website at www.qaa.ac.uk. The QAA are developing an "operational description" of how the method would be put into practice, taking account of the consultation responses.

4.   A central element of the proposed method concerns the forms of information about the quality and standards of learning and teaching which each higher education institution (HEI) should be expected to have available internally; and those parts of that information which they should publish to meet the needs of students and other stakeholders. A separate group was established to consider what that information should be, chaired by Professor Sir Ron Cooke, Vice-Chancellor of the University of York. The group's initial proposals were published for consultation as HEFCE 01/66 (available on the HEFCE website). The group's final report is about to be published, including an analysis of the consultation responses.

The group proposed that information from students about their experience and views of quality and standards should be an essential element, both of the information available within each HEI and of the information that should be published. [CUT THIS AS WE HAVE NOT INCLUDED APPENDIX A]

5.   The group initially concluded that a national survey of the opinions of recent graduates could be included within the existing First Destination Survey (FDS) to the Student Record administered annually by the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA). However, a separate consultation conducted by HESA showed widespread concern that this could distort the nature and purpose of the FDS and make it more difficult to administer. So the group has concluded that a separate national survey needs to be designed.

6.   The group commissioned an initial paper from Professor Lee Harvey on experience of designing and administering student satisfaction surveys at the University of Central England, and the implications of that experience for good practice. Professor Harvey has kindly agreed to make the report available to all who wish to see it (see paragraph 12 of the consultation paper 01/66).

7.   In discussion with the National Union of Students (NUS) and other student representatives, it was emphasised that student surveys, while very useful, are not the only method for securing student feedback. Other forms of feedback are also important – for example, representation of students on course and faculty committees, and focus groups to discuss students' experiences in more detail.

8.   In its operational description, the QAA is developing this theme, emphasising the importance of student feedback as an integral part of the conduct of institutional audit reviews.

Review specification

9.   Against this background, we invite proposals to undertake a project with the following elements.

10.   The project would be in two main parts: firstly to provide advice on the design and implementation of a national survey, and secondly to identify good practice and make recommendations on the use of different internal feedback instruments (both questionnaires and other forms such as student representation) by individual HEIs. Careful articulation of the two parts will be essential so that, when implemented, they are mutually reinforcing with a minimum of duplication.

11.   The reason for envisaging both a national survey and individual HEI feedback instruments is that they are designed to achieve different things. A national survey should be designed to provide data which are fully comparable and consistent across all HEIs in England; and to focus on the views and experiences of recent graduates. But necessarily if it is to be kept within manageable limits, it will cover only a limited number of key questions. Individual HEI instruments, by contrast, need to vary so as to reflect the particular circumstances and needs of each HEI. But, building on the wide range of existing practice in HEIs, they will generate a much richer and more comprehensive range of qualitative and quantitative information for the institution to use formatively in identifying how to raise the quality of its programmes.

12.   In relation to both parts of the project, it will be important to consider carefully, and make recommendations on:

        a.   ways of securing the validity, authenticity, reliability and integrity of the survey methods and the data which they produce, taking account of best practice in survey methodology;

b.   what indicators of "satisfaction" should be used, to give the most appropriate link with common expectations of what should constitute a satisfactory experience of higher education, and to provide information which is useful to students and other stakeholders;

c.   what the costs and benefits will be for HEIs, students and the HEFCE.

National Survey

13.   This section of the project would review relevant good practice in the conduct of national opinion surveys. It would make practical recommendations on the design and implementation of a survey of the opinions of recent graduates about the quality and standards of the HE programmes they have recently completed, and the extent to which their actual experience of higher education met their original expectations and intentions. At present no such national survey is conducted in England. But the review should consider:

a.   experience of conducting the First Destination Survey;

b.   experience in other countries of administering surveys of current students and/or recent graduates, including the Australian national survey of recent graduate opinion;

c.   lessons to be learnt from the conduct of surveys outside higher education with comparable objectives.

14.   The intention is to conduct the survey on an annual basis, so as to build a consistent time series. It needs to be large enough in scale to generate valid information on each HEI in England. But it is not expected to disaggregate the results below the level of the whole institution (for example to department or subject area). It may be helpful for the results to be reported by broad subject area nationally.

15.   The areas to be covered by the project must include (but are not limited to):

a.   The questions to be asked in the survey. Our working assumption is that the questions should be both backward-looking and forward-looking – i.e. asking about the experience of HE, perceptions of its quality and standards, and how well it equipped graduates for their future careers and lives.

b.   How the survey might best be administered (e.g., whether by telephone, letter or other means; and what type of organisation might best conduct it). This should include looking specifically at the interaction with the First Destination Survey conducted by HESA to avoid unnecessary duplication of burdens.

c.   The point at which recent graduates would best be approached (i.e. how long after they have graduated).

d.   The population to be covered. It is for consideration as part of the project whether the survey could feasibly and usefully cover not only those who successfully achieve their intended final qualification (whether sub-degree, first degree or postgraduate qualification), but also some who sat but did not pass examinations/assessments, and some who dropped out during the course.

e.   How the results of the survey might best be published.

f.   How best to set the survey up so that it is easily replicable on an annual basis.

g.   How such a survey should be marketed so as to secure a high response rate.

<u>Feedback mechanisms in individual HEIs</u>

16.   This part of the project would review good practice within individual HEIs in collecting, and using for improvement purposes, feedback from current students relating to the quality and standards of their programmes, and the extent to which their experience of HE more widely was meeting their expectations and intentions. It would have a particular focus on the use of student opinion surveys.

17.   It would review good practice in terms of:

a.   How does the HEI go about collecting quantitative and qualitative feedback information on the student experience? What forms of feedback do they use (see paragraph 8), and which do they find most useful and effective?

b.   Is there a specialist unit within the HEI which organises questionnaires and other feedback centrally? Or do different groups of staff operate their own arrangements, and if so how?

c.   What is the stated purpose of obtaining feedback[1]? What is the scope (if any) for students collectively to influence the issues on which, and the method by which, feedback is sought?

d.   How often is the feedback collected?

e.   At what level is information collected: at programme/course, faculty/department, common service (e.g. IT or library and learning resources), or whole institution level?

f.   What questions are asked?

g.   In relation to opinion surveys, what is the balance between quantified "tick box" questions and free form comment sections?

h.   How is the feedback collected (e.g. hard copy surveys; intranet surveys; focus group discussions; student membership of committees and groups)? HEIs have extensive IT networks and many students have access to institutional intranets. Some institutions make extensive use of IT-based systems both as a means of surveying students and to speed up the collection and analysis of questionnaire results.   Good practice in the use of IT should be identified.

i.   Who analyses the information?

---

[1] This project is not concerned with the operation of complaints procedures for students to raise individual or collective complaints.

j.   In what form are the results reported back to staff (whole institution? by subject? by faculty etc).

k.   How are the results reported back to students?

l.   Are the results made public outside the HEI? If so, in what form?

m.   Who (if anyone) decides what action to take in the light of the results? Where an area of concern is identified, is there an established method and timetable for addressing it?

n.   How is that action reported to those concerned?

o.   Who (if anyone) checks whether the action is actually taken, and what effect it has? Is there any iterative loop for students to express a view on the effectiveness of the action?

p.   How long does the cycle take from start to finish?

18.   The report should recommend good practice in each of the items at paragraph 18 a – p (and any others identified by the project team as significant). It is for the project team to identify what constitutes good practice. But our current presumptions are:

a.   Student opinion surveys should be conducted consistently within each HEI across its different schools, faculties and departments, in order to generate a consistent set of results. We expect that a core set of standard questions will need to be identified, which all HEIs should include in surveys and which would be reported publicly on a standard basis. This may well imply central administration within the HEI, at least of some elements. We would, however, expect that surveys also allow for individual tailoring to the circumstances of different programmes, departments and units. This gives the staff concerned (academic, support and administrative) the opportunity to obtain the information they believe will be of most value to them in assessing current performance and how it can be improved. So we need to balance consistency in feedback on core issues across the institution without damaging the flow of more specific and tailored information to address local issues for individual groups.

b.   For purposes of reporting back the results of student opinion surveys within the HEI, it should be possible to disaggregate the results to the level of the individual programme, because a primary purpose of getting the information is in order that the quality of individual programmes can be improved.

c.   Surveys should include quantifiable "tick-box" elements, capable of being analysed electronically. But they should not be limited to "tick-boxes", but should give students opportunities to comment, expand and explain in their own words. This is valuable to enable the staff responsible for each programme to interpret and understand the results.

d.   In order that the results may carry credibility with students and others, surveys need to be administered, and the results analysed, in a way which is, and is seen to be, free from the risk of manipulation and distortion.

e.   The consultation paper, HEFCE 01/66, envisaged that the results of student opinion surveys would be published in summary form. This could be done in HEI prospectuses, or

through links on the HEI's website from the prospectus to summary results of the latest survey, how it compares with the previous survey, and the improvement actions taken since that previous survey.

f.   If students are to be willing to keep completing surveys, it is important that the HEI has rapid and effective mechanisms for deciding, and reporting, what follow up action has been, and will be, taken to enhance quality and standards and to address areas of concern identified by students.

19.   The project report will need to address each of items a – f in paragraph 19.

20.   The conduct of the project would be for the tenderer to propose. Our current assumption is that all HEIs would be invited to provide any existing material they wished that was relevant to the review. The project team would review all evidence received. From that first sift, they would organise face-to-face or telephone structured interviews with a sample of HEIs and student unions. To keep the exercise within reasonable limits, that sample should be no larger than 20. HEIs and student unions would be invited to volunteer.

21.   We envisage – but again this is for the tenderer to propose – that the interviews should seek views from several parties within an HEI:

a.   At least one member of staff involved in the design and administration of student opinion surveys and other feedback mechanisms.

b.   At least one member of staff who receives the results of the feedback and is expected to act on them.

c.   At least one student serving as a course representative.

22.   Tenders should include proposals for reviewing the experience of other sectors outside higher education. A review of research literature on the use of satisfaction surveys outside the HE sector could be a useful starting point.

23.   The report of this part of the project should identify good practice, and a set of recommended principles and expectations, for HEIs to consider.

Appendix B
Questionnaire for HEIs on internal student feedback processes

Dear

Project on collecting and using student feedback on quality and standards of learning and teaching in higher education

You should have received a letter from …….. of HEFCE dated ………. about the above project. CHERI is pleased to be part of the team (with SQW Limited and NOP) to undertake this project. This letter is in connection with the part dealing with the following objective:

> *Review current practice by higher education institutions (HEIs) in collecting quantitative and qualitative feedback from students on the quality and standards of their higher education programmes, and using that feedback to secure improvement.*

Accordingly, we are inviting all HEIs in England to provide us with information on their policies and practices in collecting and using student feedback. This will be followed up with visits by members of the research team to a sample of HEIs in September/October.

We have set out a number of questions below (*Section A*) regarding student feedback at your own institution. We do not necessarily expect detailed answers to each of the questions; they should be used as a guide only to the institution's response. Moreover, we are aware that many institutions have comprehensive guidelines, handbooks and codes of practice on student feedback. Where these exist, we would be interested to see them and we are happy for them to be used as a reference for the answers to our questions.

In addition, we would also welcome comments from your institution on a set of presumptions (*Section B*) that have already been made on what might constitute good practice (as outlined in HEFCE's tender specification for this project).

We have also included a question on feedback from recent graduates (*Section C*). This relates to the second part of the project – a national survey of recent graduates. The project will make recommendations on the design and implementation of a survey to find out from graduates their views on the quality and standards of their higher education programmes. To help inform this part of the project, we are interested to find out whether institutions undertake such surveys themselves, in addition to the First Destinations Survey.

We would welcome responses by …. . We are aware that much effort has already been expended by HEIs in response to consultations about the new quality assurance methods and the use of information to support quality and standards. We would like to thank you in advance for this additional effort we are asking of your institution in responding to our request.

Responses should be sent to ……. Please note that copies of this letter and the three sections mentioned above can be found on the CHERI website at: ……….

Section A: Questions on student feedback policies and practices

The main focus of the project is on student opinion surveys, but other forms of feedback are equally important and therefore information on all forms of feedback, including focus groups, student representation on boards and committees, is requested. Questions are presented under four headings, three of which deal with student feedback in general, while the other deals with student opinion surveys in particular.

If it is more convenient to answer a question by reference to an existing document, please either enclose the relevant document with your reply, or, if the document is available on the institution's website, please supply the URL address.

1. Purposes and main users

1.1 Please state any institution wide policies on the collection and use of student feedback.

1.2 What does the institution consider to be the main purposes of obtaining feedback[2]? (See also question 1.7.)

1.3 What role does student feedback play in the overall context of your institution's quality assurance policy?

1.4 What forms of feedback are generally found to be most useful and effective and by whom in the institution?

1.5 What is the scope (if any) for students collectively to influence the issues on which, and the method by which, feedback is sought?

1.6 Is any information based on student feedback published and, if so, what sort of information and where is it published? (We would be very interested to see some examples, if these are available.)

1.7 Please list the main levels e.g. individual lecture or class, module, programme, department, school/faculty, at which student feedback is obtained and indicate the main purposes for seeking feedback at the different levels.

1.8 Please list any common services (e.g. library, careers services, IT) for which student feedback is obtained and the main purposes for seeking such feedback in each of the cases identified.

1.9 If information is collected at more than one level, are the levels related (e.g., are they aggregated for the purposes of deciding what action to take, if any)?

2. Student opinion surveys (if necessary, please cross-refer to answers given elsewhere)

2.1 At what levels are student opinion surveys used?

2.2 What kinds of response rates are normally obtained at the different levels?

2.3 What questions are asked? We are very interested to collect examples of questionnaires. Therefore, you might find it easier to answer this question by providing some examples of questionnaires that are used in your institution and at the various levels.

---

[2] This project is not concerned with the operation of complaints procedures for students to raise individual or collective complaints.

2.4   To whom, (individuals, committees etc) are the results of the surveys reported?

2.5   To what extent are the results of surveys aggregated to provide an institutional picture?

3.   *Extent of central policy or devolved arrangements*

Central responsibility

3.1   Is there a central unit responsible for the collection, analysis and presentation of student feedback? How many staff does it possess and where is it located organisationally in the institution?

3.2   Is the unit responsible for all student feedback in the institution? If not, how are the responsibilities divided?

Devolved responsibility

3.3   Please indicate the extent to which the formulation of policy about student feedback is devolved within the institution.

3.4   Please indicate the extent to which the implementation of central policy about student feedback is devolved within the institution.

3.5   If responsibility for student feedback is devolved, does the institution issue guidelines (or even a common questionnaire) and what are the mechanisms for monitoring compliance with the guidelines?

4.   *Follow-up and monitoring*

4.1   To what extent is there a systematic follow up of the results of student feedback (i.e., who decides what action to take; who checks whether action is actually taken, and what effect it has; is there an established method and timetable for addressing areas of concern)? If appropriate, please answer the question in the context of both central and devolved arrangements.

4.2   To what extent are there arrangements in place to report the results of student feedback (both central and devolved) to students?

4.3   To what extent are there arrangements in place to report the results of actions taken in response to student feedback (both central and devolved) to students?

4.4   Is there an iterative loop for students to express a view on the effectiveness of the action (both central and devolved)?

Section B: Presumptions about good practice

In addition to these questions, the tender specification for this project made certain presumptions about good practice. These are reproduced below and we would welcome your views on each of them as well as an indication of the extent to which this practice is or is not followed in your institution. (Of course, you may already have provided answers to some or all of these with reference to the above the questions, but we would still welcome your views.) The presumptions made are as follows:

1. Student opinion surveys should be conducted consistently within each HEI across its different schools, faculties and departments, in order to generate a consistent set of results. We expect that a core set of standard questions will need to be identified, which all HEIs should include in surveys and which would be reported publicly on a standard basis. This may well imply central administration within the HEI, at least of some elements. We would, however, expect that surveys also allow for individual tailoring to the circumstances of different programmes, departments and units. This gives the staff concerned (academic, support and administrative) the opportunity to obtain the information they believe will be of most value to them in assessing current performance and how it can be improved. So we need to balance consistency in feedback on core issues across the institution without damaging the flow of more specific and tailored information to address local issues for individual groups.

2. For purposes of reporting back the results of student opinion surveys within the HEI, it should be possible to disaggregate the results to the level of the individual programme, because a primary purpose of getting the information is in order that the quality of individual programmes can be improved.

3. Surveys should include quantifiable "tick-box" elements, capable of being analysed electronically. But they should not be limited to "tick-boxes", but should give students opportunities to comment, expand and explain in their own words. This is valuable to enable the staff responsible for each programme to interpret and understand the results.

4. In order that the results may carry credibility with students and others, surveys need to be administered, and the results analysed, in a way which is, and is seen to be, free from the risk of manipulation and distortion.

5. The consultation paper, 01/66, envisaged that the results of student opinion surveys would be published in summary form. This could be done in HEI prospectuses, or through links on the HEIs website from the prospectus to summary results of the latest survey, how it compares with the previous survey, and the improvement actions taken since that previous survey.

6. If students are to be willing to keep completing surveys, it is important that the HEI has rapid and effective mechanisms for deciding, and reporting, what follow up action has been, and will be, taken to enhance quality and standards and to address areas of concern identified by students.

Section C: Feedback from recent graduates

Does your institution collect and use feedback from recent graduates (including students who did not complete their studies or who did so unsuccessfully) on the quality and standards of their programmes? If so, how and in what form? And for what purpose? (We would be very interested to see some examples, if these are available.)

Appendix C

Institutions visited

University of Central England in Birmingham

Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies

University of Birmingham

Bishop Grosseteste College

Bolton Institute of Higher Education

Arts Institute at Bournemouth

University of Bradford

University of Bristol

De Montfort University

University of Hertfordshire

Keele University

Liverpool John Moores University

The London Institute

Loughborough University

Nottingham Trent University

The Open University

University of Oxford

University of Southampton

University of Sunderland

University of Sussex

Appendix D
Aide-Mémoire for discussions with students

Introductory remarks

The Higher Education Funding Council for England is considering whether to undertake a national survey of recent graduates to gather information on levels of satisfaction with **teaching and learning** on the programmes of study they have undertaken. The results would be published and it is anticipated they would be useful to, amongst others, individuals deciding which higher education institution to study at. SQW Limited will be making recommendations to HEFCE on what form the survey might take. As part of this work we are undertaking a survey of first year undergraduates to explore whether such information might have been useful to them when applying to university and, if so, what form the survey should take.

Any information you provide during the interview will be confidential to SQW and the results of the interviews will only be reported to HEFCE in aggregate.

1. *Background*:

1.1. About yourself

1.1.1. HEI

1.1.2. First three choices of HEIs on UCAS application form (in order of preference)

1.1.3. Programme of study

1.1.4. Age at beginning of programme

1.2. when you applied to enter higher education:

1.2.1. What information do you use to decide between options

1.2.2. How did you obtain this information/who provided it

1.2.3. In retrospect, how useful did the information prove in helping you make the best choice for yourself

1.2.4. If information on previous students' levels of satisfaction had been readily available do you think you would have used it

1.3. Do you think that graduates would be able to provide meaningful assessments of their teaching and learning experiences:

1.3.1. In comparison with other HEIs

1.3.2. In comparison with their original expectations

2. <u>*At what level should information be provided:*</u> *We need to decide the levels at which satisfaction assessments would be published. Which of the following would have been useful to you and which would be your preference?*

   [Note to interviewer: do not prompt initially but record responses which would like results to be reported at all these levels]

   2.1. An overall average for the HEI as a whole. It is likely that graduates will be asked to rate their satisfaction levels on a simple scale, say 1 to 5. This option would simply report ratings for a single HEI without distinguishing response by programme of study etc

   2.2. Classified according to broad subject areas; chemistry, history etc

   2.3. Classified according to programme of study, for example BA in Business Studies and German, BSc in Mechanical Engineering

   2.4. Classified according to modules. Note that this option could require you to review many assessments in order to arrive at an overview of a particular study programme

3. <u>*Aspects of teaching and learning:*</u> *Irrespective of the level (previous question) at which results are published there is a choice between reporting overall assessments of the quality of teaching and learning and reporting assessments of specific aspects of the teaching and learning experience. We would welcome your views on the usefulness of each of the options below and your preferences. The interviewer will talk through these options, but in order to provide guidance on what might be possible we have attached extracts from the Australian Course Experience Questionnaire which is administered to all Australian graduates soon after graduation.*

   3.1. The survey would report only overall levels of satisfaction with teaching and learning

   3.2. The survey would report separately on each of the following aspects of teaching and learning (as well as providing and overall assessment)

      3.2.1. The quality of teaching delivered by lecturers

      3.2.2. The effectiveness with which expectations of students were communicated to them

3.2.3. Whether workloads were appropriate

3.2.4. The ways in which student performance was assessed   15

3.2.5. The quality and availability of resources to support learning, for example, course materials, libraries, IT, private study facilities

3.2.6. Effectiveness in developing skills

3.2.7. Effectiveness in equipping students for subsequent careers

4. Programme specific information

4.1. Were there any specific aspects of the programmes you applied for which were emphasised by the HEI and which attracted you to them. For example, the availability of (perhaps work-based) placements during the programme, the availability of specialised equipment, the opportunity to undertake certain projects

4.2. If so would student feedback on these specific aspects have been useful

5. Mechanics of the survey

5.1. In what format should the survey be published, for example printed, web

5.2. How the information should be presented. For, example would it be sufficient to provide a link to the HEI website, should each HEI be respond to the results of the survey as they relate to it

5.3. Do you think the survey would need to be undertaken annually or that information from a less frequent survey would still be useful

6. Other

6.1. Are there any other points you would like to make

Australian Course Experience Questionnaire

For a number of years all graduates of Australian universities have been asked to complete a Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ). Until recently the CEQ contained 24 questions and graduates were asked to specify on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the extent to which they agree with certain statements. The statements were as follows:

Good Teaching Scale (six items)
  3.   The teaching staff of this course motivated me to do my best work.
  7.   The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work.
  15.   The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work.
  17.   The teaching staff normally gave me helpful feedback on how I was going.
  18.   My lecturers were extremely good at explaining things.
  20.   The teaching staff worked hard to make their subjects interesting.

•**Clear Goals and Standards Scale** (four items)
  1.   It was always easy to know the standard of work expected.
  6.   I usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this course.
  13.   It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this course.
  24.   The staff made it clear right from the start what they expected from students.

•**Appropriate Workload Scale** (four items)
  4.   The workload was too heavy.
  14.   I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn.
  21.   There was a lot of pressure on me to do well in this course.
  23.   The sheer volume of work to be got through in this course meant it couldn't all be thoroughly comprehended.

•**Appropriate Assessment Scale** (three items)
  8.   To do well in this course all you really needed was a good memory.
  12.   The staff seemed more interested in testing what I had memorised than what I had understood.
  19.   Too many staff asked me questions just about facts.

•**Generic Skills Scale** (six items)
  2.   The course developed my problem-solving skills.
  5.   The course sharpened my analytic skills.
  9.   The course helped me develop my ability to work as a team member.
  10.   As a result of my course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems.
  11.   The course improved my skills in written communication.
  22.   My course helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work. .

Overall Satisfaction Item
        Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this course

From 2002, the Australian CEQ has changed slightly. The questions on good teaching and generic skills are compulsory but individual HEIs can choose which of the other questions are put to their students. The options are:

Student Support Scale (five items)
1. The library services were readily accessible
2. I was able to access information technology resources when I needed them
3. I was satisfied with the course and careers advice provided
4. Health, welfare and counselling services met my requirements
5. Relevant learning resources were accessible when I needed them

Learning Resources Scale (five items)
1. The library resources were appropriate for my needs
2. Where it was used, the information technology in teaching and learning was effective
3. It was made clear what resources were available to help me learn
4. The study materials were clear and concise
5. Course materials were relevant and up to date

Learning Community Scale (five items)
1. I felt part of a group of students and staff committed to learning
2. I was able to explore academic interests with staff and students
3. I learned to explore ideas confidently with other people
4. Students' ideas and suggestions were used during the course
5. I felt I belonged to the university community

Graduate Qualities Scale (six items)
1. University stimulated my enthusiasm for further learning
2. The course provided me with a broad overview of my field of knowledge
3. My university experience encouraged me to value perspectives other than my own
4. I learned to apply principles from this course to new situations
5. The course developed my confidence to investigate new ideas
6. I consider what I learned valuable for my future

Intellectual Motivation Scale (four items)
1. I found my studies intellectually stimulating
2. I found the course motivating
3. The course has stimulated my interest in the field of study

Appendix E
Proposed questionnaire for the National Survey

For each of the questions below please use the scale 1 – 5, by circling the appropriate box, to indicate how far you agree with the statement. 1 indicates that you strongly disagree with the statement, 5 that you strongly agree and the numbers in between intermediate positions. In responding please think about your programme of studies as a whole rather than individual lectures or modules.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
When it was needed, there was sufficient access to specialised equipment or facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers and tutors made the subjects interesting	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers and tutors motivated me to do my best work	1	2	3	4	5
The programme helped me develop my ability to work as a team member	1	2	3	4	5
The programme improved my skills in written communication	1	2	3	4	5
As a result of my programme, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems	1	2	3	4	5
I was not able to access IT resources to the extent I needed to	1	2	3	4	5
I felt a lot of pressure, from lecturers and tutors, to do well in the programme	1	2	3	4	5
The programme sharpened my analytical skills	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers and tutors made a real effort to understand difficulties I experienced with my work	1	2	3	4	5
Over the whole programme, I was given sufficient support with my studies by lecturers and tutors	1	2	3	4	5
The sheer volume of work meant it could not all be thoroughly comprehended	1	2	3	4	5
The programme developed my problem-solving skills	1	2	3	4	5
For most of the programme, the workload was too heavy	1	2	3	4	5
I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn	1	2	3	4	5
Programme materials (lecture notes, work sheets, CD-ROMs etc) were useful	1	2	3	4	5
Availability and access to library resources were appropriate for my need	1	2	3	4	5
It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this programme	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Lecturers and tutors normally gave me helpful feedback on my progress	1	2	3	4	5
There was good advice available on which programme options were best suited to my needs and interest	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I was satisfied with the quality of this programme	1	2	3	4	5
It was always easy to know what standard of work I was expected to achieve	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers and tutors put a lot of time into commenting on my work	1	2	3	4	5
During my first year, I needed more support and advice with my studies than I received	1	2	3	4	5
I found other students helped me with my studies during the programme	1	2	3	4	5
There were insufficient opportunities to apply the theoretical knowledge I acquired to practical situations	1	2	3	4	5
My programme helped me to develop the ability to manage my own work.	1	2	3	4	5
Staff made it clear from the start what they expected from students	1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers and tutors were good at explaining things	1	2	3	4	5

Please tick the three aspects of your programme which were best and the three which could be most improved

	Best	Could be improved
Acquiring knowledge of the subject		
Acquiring generic skills such as problem solving, team working and communication		
Quality of the teaching staff		
Access to specialised equipment		
Availability and access to learning resources such as the library, programme materials and IT		
Advice and support from staff on academic issues		
Opportunities to test theoretical knowledge in a practical situation		
A workload which was appropriate to the time and resources available to students		