



POLICY ON STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEY (SFS) / EQUIVALENT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This policy presents a framework for undertaking evaluation to ascertain and monitor the quality of teaching and learning processes and outcomes, and in turn to provide an informed basis for making decisions to enhance teaching and learning in the University. This policy also establishes procedures that must be followed for the summative evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

This policy is intended to facilitate the use of the Student Feedback Survey (SFS)/equivalent as a developmental, formative evaluation of teaching and learning tool that can be used to:

- evaluate the impact of teaching from the students' perspective;
- provide information for continuous improvement; especially in terms of teaching and learning;
- provide evidence for quality audit processes;
- assist in the professional development of academic staff; and
- assist, on a case-to-case basis, in decisions regarding renewal of contract and promotional, identifying exceptional teachers for teaching awards and documenting exceptional teaching.

3.0 ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Office of Deputy Rector (Academic & Planning)

Role : Custodian

Responsibility : i) To govern and manage the implementation of Student Feedback Survey / equivalent.
ii) To formulate or review any policies & procedures related to the implementation of Student Feedback Survey / equivalent in IIUM.

3.2 Office of Institutional and Academic Quality Management (OQM)

Role : Owner/Monitoring

Responsibility : i) To obtain the analysis report of Student Feedback Survey / equivalent from the respective Centre of Studies (COS) and Centre for Teaching and Learning

(CTL) and make consolidation report and table it in the Management Review Meeting.

- ii) To prepare a recommendation for improvement to Office of Deputy Rector (Academic & Planning) based on the feedback obtained from Management Review Meeting.
- iii) To be the Secretariat or Coordinator in managing the implementation process, contents of this instrument and information of Student Feedback Survey (equivalent).
- iv) To review and make improvement of the effectiveness of the Student Feedback Survey / equivalent.
- v) To coordinate meetings with regards to Student Feedback Survey / equivalent to be chaired by the Deputy Rector (Academic & Planning).

3.3 Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) / Equivalent*

** Entity that is assigned to administer the feedback by the agencies.*

Role : Operation / Administration

- Responsibility :
- i) To administer the process of disseminating the Student Feedback Survey / equivalent to the targeted students.
 - ii) To manage the process of notifying students and staff on the exercise.
 - iii) To maintain any systems or databases or online records of the Student Feedback Survey / equivalent.
 - iv) To submit analysis report at the university level to OQM at the end of every run.
 - v) To plan and arrange suitable training programmes for identified non-performers.

3.4 Centre of Studies (COS)

Role : Implementing Bodies

- Responsibility :
- i) To monitor the implementation of Student Feedback Survey / equivalent at the respective Centre of Studies (COS).

- ii) To prepare reports based on the data obtained from the survey. The reports may consist of the followings:
 - a. individual lecturer and tutor evaluations;
 - b. course, subject, section, programme and other evaluations that are deemed to be important for improvement; and
 - c. facilities of teaching
- iii) To submit the prepared report to OQM at the run of every run
- iv) To undertake necessary initiatives to improve the quality of lecturers, tutors, academic programmes and teaching activities based on the evaluations.
- v) To manage the process of notifying the students and staff on the exercise.
- vi) To maintain all records of information relating to the teaching evaluation of their academic staff for use in annual performance review and staff development processes.

3.5 **Academic Staff**

- Responsibility :
- i) To improve the effectiveness of their own individual contribution to the quality of students' learning experience, using an appropriate mix of teaching & learning methods;
 - ii) To access, generate and make use of the SFS/equivalent for continuous improvement;
 - iii) To maintain their own personal and confidential records of information relating to their teaching evaluations for use in annual performance review and development processes with their academic supervisor and for use when making formal claims.

3.6 **Students**

- Responsibility :
- i) To contribute constructive feedback on the quality of teaching and subject through the SFS / equivalent.
 - ii) To provide feedback which is free from racist, sexist or abusive intent as per the University's Code of Conduct

and other related policies.

4.0 SCOPE OF APPLICATION

- 4.1 The implementation of the policy and the adoption of SFS or any equivalent instrument shall be applied to all Centre of Studies (COS).
- 4.2 All students are required to provide response to the Student Feedback Survey (SFS) / equivalent.
- 4.3 All courses delivered by Centre of Studies (COS) at IIUM must be evaluated by students each time the course is taught except as indicated in 4.4 below.
- 4.4 Courses that have enrolments too low to ensure anonymity of student evaluation ($n \leq 15$) or that do not present course material (e.g., undergraduate and graduate research, internship, independent study, supervised teaching) will not be evaluated using the Student Feedback Survey (SFS) / equivalent.
- 4.5 The evaluation will involve all teaching staff in that particular semester, full-time and part-time.
- 4.6 The method of distributing the SFS / equivalent can be diverse depending on the method's effectiveness. It can be done manually during the classes or through online approach, as per needed.

5.0 EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

- 5.1 The university instrument for evaluation for the Student Feedback Survey (SFS) / equivalent is made up of a rating scale and an open-ended part which should address the objectives of the instrument as per Section 2.0.
- 5.2 The instrument will be reviewed and validated periodically as necessary.

6.0 PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION

- 6.1 Anonymity and confidentiality are the basic principles that govern distributing, collecting and handling student evaluations. Strict adherence to procedures that insure anonymity and confidentiality is imperative so that students feel free to provide honest and candid perception of teaching effectiveness.
- 6.2 Student evaluation of teaching must be conducted every time a course is taught except as noted in Section 4.4. The SFS will be made available to each student during the 10th week of the semester and ends during the final examination period.
- 6.3 The SFS is to be completed once per semester within the following timeframe:

- Semester I & II: From Week 10 until the first day of the final examination period.
 - Block system: During the last 2/3 (two-third) of that particular block.
- 6.4 All students must complete the SFS within the time period allocated. Failure to do so will cause the student's examination slip or examination results to be withheld or as determined by the Senate from time to time. It will be released once the student completes the SFS.
- 6.5 Centre of Studies (COS), academic staff and administrators must not have access to the evaluation data until after final grades for the course have been submitted.
- 6.6 The Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) will carry out the data analysis in a timely manner so that data will be available for personnel decisions and for enhancing teaching effectiveness.
- 6.7 SFS reports will be made available to all lecturers and COS administrators after all final student grades have been submitted.
- 6.8 Lecturers can generate their individual results of SFS. The respective academic administrators can generate the related reports and to be discussed at the management level of respective Centre of Studies (COS).

7.0 MAINTAINING STUDENT EVALUATION DATA

- 7.1 Completed SFS results and resulting summary data are confidential.
- 7.2 Academic staff are not allowed to see the detailed students' responses in the online SFS in order to maintain confidentiality.
- 7.3 Academic staff must be shown their individual summarized SFS results.
- 7.4 Original or summary data from the SFS results, including student responses to open-ended questions, must be retained for at least twelve months.
- 7.5 Data collected on SFS shall be securely stored by the university.

8.0 USE OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS

- 8.1 Because the results of student evaluation of teaching are used in personnel decisions, interpreting evaluation results must be done with caution.
- 8.2 Teaching effectiveness must not be based on any single source of data. Interpretation of student evaluations must be based on all questions from the online SFS.

- 8.3 Lecturers who obtain a score of below 80% for three consecutive semesters are to be recommended by their Heads of Departments to attend the Teaching Methodology Course or advanced teaching and learning course.
- 8.4 The results of SFS must not be used solely for the staff's appraisal and promotion.
- 8.5 Individual SFS results may be shared only with heads of department, relevant administrators, and other staff involved in personnel decisions.
- 8.6 Academic staff may share their individual SFS results but not the SFS results of other instructors involved in the class without written permission.
- 8.7 SFS reports will not be generated when insufficient data has been collected for a valid evaluation of teaching.
- 8.8 If student response rate for a class is below the minimum number ($n \leq 4$) of responses needed to produce a useable report, comparisons to other classes or sections must not be made.
- 8.9 Any other use of the results.

9.0 PREROGATIVE OF THE SENATE

- 9.1 The Senate of the University reserves the right to amend or overrule any article of this policy at any time.