SUBMISSION TO SEG EDUCATION COMMITTEE

FOR INFORMATION: 2012 TEACHING QUALITY STANDARDS COMPACTS

ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES FINAL REPORT: 01/01/2012 – 31/07/2013

IRENA KOPRINSKA, SUB-DEAN (L&T), ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

Recommendation: That SEG Education note the faculty report.

1. Outcomes
Note: The minimum response rate is 30%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>2011 Baseline</th>
<th>S2 2012–S1 2013 Outcome</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve the quality of the student experience in the 26 UoS which were below the agreed minimum USE standard of 20% disagreement on overall satisfaction (Q12) in 2011.</td>
<td>2. 8% 26/316 UoS with ≥ 20% disagreement (Q12)</td>
<td>24/26 UoS have improved</td>
<td>1. All of these 26 UoS were re-surveyed in either Semester 2, 2012 or Semester 1, 2013. Now 20 of them meet the minimum standard, 4 have improved and approach the minimum standard (with 2 of them at 20% disagreement) and 2 are yet to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decrease the percentage of UoS in the 2012 survey with more than 20% disagreement on overall satisfaction (Q12) from 8% in 2011 to 2% in 2012/2013.</td>
<td>2. 9% 29/321 UoS with ≥ 20% disagreement (Q12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The target is not met. The results are similar to the baseline period – there is 1% increase in the % of UoS with disagreement ≥ 20%. The number of surveyed UoS has increased from 316 to 321.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decrease the percentage of UoS in the 2012 survey with more than 20% disagreement on feedback (Q8) from 18% in 2011 to 10% in 2012/2013.</td>
<td>3. 19% 60/321 UoS with ≥ 20% disagreement (Q8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. The target is not met. The results are similar to the baseline period - there is 1% increase in the % of UoS with disagreement ≥ 20%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Strategies that contributed significantly towards achievement of targets

- Improved Faculty USE process - The minimum standard was revised to also include % disagreement on Q8 (feedback), in addition to % disagreement on Q12 (overall satisfaction).

- Detailed analysis of the USE data - The USE data was analysed to identify the strong and weak areas at a Faculty and school level.

- School action plans - The Associate Dean (Education) and the Sub-Dean (L&T) met with the Heads of School and the School Directors L&T of the five schools in the Faculty to discuss the USE results, targets and systemic issues. An action plan for addressing the issues was agreed with each School.

- Commendation strategy - A new commendation strategy based USE data was developed, and is currently being revised to better recognise good teaching of large UoS.

- Workshop to share good practice - A Faculty workshop was organised, including sessions on how to provide effective feedback to students, how to use advanced technology in teaching, and also talks by the winners of the Faculty teaching and tutoring awards.

3. Issues that hindered achievement of targets

- Providing individual feedback to students is a challenge, especially in large UoS. The allocated marking time and budget for tutors to help with this is not sufficient.

- Not all feedback given to students is recognised as feedback, especially collective feedback given after an assignment or at the end of a tutorial.

- There are continuing issues with academic staff prioritizing research over teaching and aging teaching infrastructure.

- Improving overall satisfaction requires work on several aspects of teaching and curriculum, and this takes time.
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