



Case studies to enhance online student evaluation: Bond University – Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching

Kinash, Shelley; Naidu, Vishendran; Judd, Madelaine-Marie; Fleming, Julie; Nair, Chenicheri Sid; Santhanam, Elizabeth; Tucker, Beatrice; Tulloch, Marian

Licence:
CC BY-SA

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):

Kinash, S., Naidu, V., Judd, M.-M., Fleming, J., Nair, C. S., Santhanam, E., Tucker, B., & Tulloch, M. (2015). *Case studies to enhance online student evaluation: Bond University – Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching*. Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

11-18-2015

Case studies to enhance online student evaluation: Bond University – Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching

Shelley Kinash

Bond University, shelley.kinash@gmail.com

Vishen Naidu

Bond University, Vishen_Naidu@bond.edu.au

Madelaine Judd

Bond University, madelaine_001@hotmail.com

Melanie Fleming

Bond University, M_Fleming@bond.edu.au

Julie Fleming

Central Queensland University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.bond.edu.au/tls>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kinash, Shelley; Naidu, Vishen; Judd, Madelaine; Fleming, Melanie; Fleming, Julie; Nair, Sid; Santhanam, Elizabeth; Tucker, Beatrice; and Tulloch, Marian, "Case studies to enhance online student evaluation: Bond University – Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching" (2015). *Learning and Teaching papers*. Paper 116.
<http://epublications.bond.edu.au/tls/116>

This Research Report is brought to you by the Learning and Teaching at ePublications@bond. It has been accepted for inclusion in Learning and Teaching papers by an authorized administrator of ePublications@bond. For more information, please contact [Bond University's Repository Coordinator](#).

Authors

Shelley Kinash, Vishen Naidu, Madelaine Judd, Melanie Fleming, Julie Fleming, Sid Nair, Elizabeth Santhanam, Beatrice Tucker, and Marian Tulloch



Case studies to enhance student evaluation

2015 Bond University:
Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching



Support for the production of this report has been provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching.



With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, and where otherwise noted, all material presented in this document is provided under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

The details of the relevant licence conditions are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>.

Requests and inquiries concerning these rights should be addressed to:
Office for Learning and Teaching
Department of Education and Training

GPO Box 9880,
Location code N255EL10
Sydney NSW 2001

<learningandteaching@education.gov.au>

2015

ISBN	PDF	978-1-76028-243-1
ISBN	PRINT	978-1-76028-245-5

Cite as: Kinash, S., Naidu, V., Judd, M-M., Fleming, M., Fleming, J., Nair, S., Santhanam, E., Tucker, B., & Tulloch, M. (2015). Case studies to enhance online student evaluation: Bond University – Surveying students online to improve learning and teaching. Sydney, Australia: Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. <http://highereducationstudentevaluation.com/>

Contents

04 Acknowledgements

05 Introduction

05 Response rates

06 Increasing student comments

06 Survey content

07 Closing the feedback loop

08 Conclusion

08 References

Acknowledgements

The project team would like to acknowledge and thank the Office for Learning and Teaching, Australian Government, for funding this research project and particularly Victoria Ross, Ellen Poels and Yamini Naidu who provided exemplar support as well as Rachel Bard for being our Bond go-to person on all matters regarding OLT projects. We acknowledge a strong team including: Leader, Associate Professor Shelley Kinash (Bond University); an exemplar Project Manager (PM), Madelaine-Marie Judd; Evaluator, Professor Sally Kift (James Cook University); Reference Group Members, Professor Bruce Ravelli, Canada and Professor Satu Kalliola, Finland; Bond University Team Member, Vishen Naidu; Associate Professor Elizabeth Santhanam (Australian Catholic University), Dr Julie Fleming (Central Queensland University); Professor Marian Tulloch (Charles Sturt University); Ms Beatrice Tucker (Curtin University); and Professor Chenicheri Sid Nair (The University of Western Australia).

We express sincere gratitude to the interview & focus group participants; we value your recommendations on how to enhance student evaluation and your ongoing commitment. We would also like to thank: Professor Keitha Dunstan for leadership, particularly in supporting our team to ensure that the derived good practices were applied to strengthen the impact on a quality student learning experience at Bond University, as the lead institution.

Our project was only possible through the support of: Andrew Calder, Elizabeth Gordon and Lynda Burke from the Bond Office of Research Services; Vishen Naidu for graphic design; Lauren Skelsey, Bond Marketing and Recruitment for providing photo stock; Daniel Hollands and Dane Marley for web development; Rachel Bard for symposium coordination and exemplar administrative support throughout the project; the Bond Events team for hosting the Symposium; dedicated student volunteers including, Jessamine (Fatos) Yilmaz, Hayley Bowman, Rose Burke, Novebry Chindy Wilbowo and staff Susie Hifo; Ron Kordyban, Christian King and Daniel Hollands for filming, editing and posting videos online; Aunty Joyce and Professor Keitha Dunstan for welcoming guests; Symposium Keynote speakers: Professor Sid Nair and Ms Beatrice Tucker; Symposium panellists and chairs including Shelley Kinash, Madelaine-Marie Judd, Ms Christina Ballantyne, Associate Professor Mahsood Shah, Mr Nigel Palmer, Mr Dylan Ettridge, Ms Tessa Daly, and Mr Ben Hartsuyker.

Introduction

One of the most sensible ways of improving learning and teaching is to ask the students for feedback. At the end of each teaching period (i.e. semester or term) all universities and many schools survey their students. Usually these surveys are managed online. Questions ask for student perceptions about teaching, assessment and workload. The survey administrators report four common problems. First, response rates are low. This means that valid and reliable conclusions cannot be drawn from the data. Second, students seldom take the time to write comments. It is comments that provide the necessary substance for meaningful change. Third, the questions are usually focussed on teaching and teachers rather than learners and the learning experience. As a result, student evaluation is usually applied only to teachers' annual reviews rather than to quality improvement of education. Fourth and as a consequence of the first three concerns, student evaluation rarely results in closing-the-loop. Closing-the-loop means that action is taken, the student feedback is applied to make meaningful changes and these improvements are clearly reported back to the students. This article reports what Bond University did to resolve these four problems of response rates, student comments, question content and application to reported quality improvement.

Traditionally, the last week of teaching amongst exam preparation was reserved for Student Evaluation of Courses and Teaching (SECT) at Bond University – using a paper-based survey instrument that was both resources intensive and cumbersome, not to mention prone to handling error. In recent years however, the move towards an online student evaluation system has become a widely accepted and well-established practice within the higher education sector. After successfully collaborating with EvaluationKIT on a pilot project implemented in 2009, Bond launched its online student evaluation system in the first trimester of 2012, with the overarching aiming of implementing a comprehensive, cost-efficient and reliable system. The system was received positively by both staff and students and delivered exceptional results. Since then, the focus has shifted to further developing the system to incorporate features/functions that a) engaged with students to allow for reflective learning b) encouraged deeper, more meaningful written comments c) contained a well-developed, balanced set of questions

Response rates

that addressed the most pertinent areas of learning and the student experience and d) facilitated greater transparency of the actions to close the loop on student feedback. The Bond University Office of Learning and Teaching worked closely with EvaluationKit to integrate four key features that address the areas highlighted above.

One of the most significant and pervasive challenges of migrating to an online student evaluation system is that inherently response rates are low (Nulty, 2008). The problem with low response rates is that they do not provide sufficient data from which to infer teaching effectiveness. Unlike paper-based evaluations where surveys could be administered to a captive audience, the nature of online student evaluations relies heavily on voluntary student participation. Through-out the literature, low response rates are cited as a fundamental disadvantage of transitioning to an online evaluation system. However, some institutions have found solutions that work around this problem such as: providing incentives, withholding or early access to results, allocating time before the end of class to complete outstanding surveys, and sending pre-notification and repeat reminders.

For Bond University improving response rates in its online SECT system was critical following a disappointing overall response rate of 42 per cent in a 2009 pilot project. Consultations with various student focus groups revealed that learners were more likely to participate if there was some type of authoritative mechanism that prompted a response to complete any outstanding evaluations. As a result of this, a decision was made in consultation with Bond University Student Association (BUSA), to integrate a pop-up module that would encourage participation, while acting as a restriction by preventing access to a student's Learning Management System account until all outstanding surveys were completed. The two options on the pop-up were to complete the evaluations or 'do it later' - the latter option temporarily disabling the pop-up for the current session to allow students to access content.

Students are also given the option to opt-out of the evaluation entirely by clicking on the statement, “I have considered completing this evaluation and have decided not to.” In the first version, students then had to insert a reason for non-completion prior to resuming access to the learning management system. Students quickly figured out that they could enter garbled text to satisfy this requirement. In the next iteration, the students simply had to click on one overall evaluation rating, thus resembling the efficiency of the TripAdvisor App. This modification was well-received by students and derived useful quality assurance data. This data is extra to that achieved by the 90 per cent response rate of the full responses. Alongside these customisations, Bond also launched an internal communication strategy that utilized posters, email notifications, in-class demonstrations and digital signage to educate staff and students about the importance of evaluations which also worked to good effect in increasing engagement and creating awareness of the new system. When compared with the result of the pilot project, these strategies resulted in very high response rates, exceeding 90 per cent across the university in every semester.

Increasing student comments

While response rates are an important factor in increasing the reliability and accuracy of student feedback, improving the quantity and quality of student comments is equally important in understanding how students perceived the quality of the teaching of the subject. Each student has a unique learning style which has a significant impact on the way they react to different teaching styles and environments (Lewis, 2001). While the analysis of quantitative data can provide quantifiable and easy to understand results, it is the qualitative data that can provide greater insight and suggestions of what areas can be improved or maintained. One way in which Bond has developed this area is by encouraging instructors to engage with students in the classroom on the significance of student evaluations and the importance of written comments. This often helps students frame and structure their responses based on their classroom discussions. The Bond University Office of Learning and Teaching also actively promotes the importance of student comments through email campaigns, digital signage and student association publications. The introduction of the QUILT-SF (Quality Improvement In Learning and Teaching) initiative has also helped reinforce the practical use of student evaluations, which provides direct evidence that

steps are taken in considering their feedback, thereby encouraging students to provide more thoughtful comments.

Survey content

SECT is one of the most prevalent methods of soliciting feedback from students about their perceptions of the courses they’re taking and the instructors that teach them. The design of the instruments and survey questions vary widely from institution to institution, but most often contain a set amount of fixed questions supplemented with some open ended questions. Beyond the typical SECT questions that concentrate on evaluating learning and teaching across courses, few institutions utilize measurements that gauge student engagement and the overall student experience. When it became clear that the survey instrument that was being used at the time wasn’t capturing the relevant data to ensure the quality of learning and teaching at Bond, a decision was made to develop a new subject evaluation instrument that would also draw on student perceptions of engagement and the student experience. The construction of the new instrument was reviewed, validated and implemented under the direction of the Learning and Teaching committee. The new question items were reformatted as follows:

- 1) The assessment tasks are appropriate to the learning outcomes**
- 2) The learning activities in this subject helped me to learn effectively**
- 3) The workload in this subject was realistic and appropriate**
- 4) I felt engaged by this subject**
- 5) Overall I am satisfied with the quality of this subject.**



Closing the feedback loop

When students participate in the evaluation process, their primary concerns are whether their opinions actually matter, what happens to their responses and what actions/steps are taken in addressing their concerns. Responding to student feedback does not always warrant meeting expectations - however students do want to feel involved in the process and do expect a level of transparency when it comes to responding to their feedback (Watson, 2003).

Universities and schools using online evaluation surveys report the quantitative results through descriptive statistics. Usually the mean and standard deviation of responses to each question are reported and charted. Online evaluation has the advantage of technology-enabled developments. Modern researchers conducting qualitative research use analysis software to efficiently identify key themes. Some online evaluation systems now include qualitative analysis in their packages. Bond's selected system, EvaluationKIT, includes text-based analysis. As a result, educators can quickly see that student comments are primarily about aspects such as assessment and then see whether the overall sentiment is positive or negative. This data analysis substantially increases the power of evaluation to lead to quality improvement. A newly developed feedback system that Bond is currently trialling draws on the written comments using a content analysis tool to close the loop on student feedback. The introduction of the QUILT-SF system, , was designed to provide explicit evidence of the university's response to student feedback and improvement. The idea was inspired by conversations with former executive members of the Bond University Student Association (BUSA), and falls directly in-line with requirements set out by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA).

In developing the system, Bond University worked with EvaluationKit to automate the analysis of the student qualitative data. The system utilizes a comprehensive content analysis platform to identify prevalent themes/issues. Where there is sufficient comment data derived from the subject/course evaluations, the comments are grouped into themes depending on their frequency of occurrence. The content of the resulting reports includes: all student comments as entered, thematic analysis, and descriptive statistics from Likert scale items. Subject coordinators/Heads of school use this data to identify what responsive actions for improvement or maintenance need to be taken for the relevant subject(s), if applicable. The process then passes through the relevant Associate Dean of Learning and Teaching, who quality checks the reports before they are submitted to be queued for publication. Operationally, the QUILT-SF reports are accessible to students as a PDF link on the online subject outlines. When clicked, the link will direct students to the PDF report which outlines: a) a summary of the prevalent item of student feedback regarding suggested maintenance or improvement of a subject and/or its teaching b) the action taken in response to that feedback, and c) the date it is anticipated to be actioned.

Based on the examples discussed in this paper, the below tables outlines some of the key takeaways for improving evaluation through the use of online surveying.

Pop-up feature	Use an online pop-up feature that integrates with the learning management system to improve response rates
Usability	Create a user-friendly system, making it easy for students to enter comments and advertise the importance of the comments.
Text Analysis	Use a text-analysis program to identify key themes from the comments. Respond specifically to these themes and report resulting actions taken online.
Survey Design/Construct	Ensure that the wording of the questions will derive responses that will achieve the goals motivating the evaluation i.e. If the purpose of the evaluation is to improve learning, then ask the students what changes would help them learn. Link the resulting actions to relevant online

Conclusion

In summary, online student evaluation systems have become a widely regarded and versatile mechanism for gathering feedback on student perceptions. While this practice is not without its challenges, the combination of these strategies in analysing and improving student feedback may help educational institutions build a comprehensive system capable of accurately improving learning and teaching, and ultimately enhancing the student experience. Given the importance placed on the process, it is important that these system instruments are valid and reliable measurements of gathering data on student perceptions. It is also essential that institutions actively build awareness among students about the importance of student feedback and ensure that steps are taken to respond to their concerns.

References

- Bond University. (2014). *Student Evaluation of Teaching Policy* (Policy number TLR 2.07). Retrieved from http://bond.edu.au/prod_ext/groups/public/@pub-qa-gen/documents/policy/bd3_028292.pdf
- Lewis, K. G. (2001). Making sense of student written comments. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 87, 25–32.
- Nulty, D.D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3), 301-314.