THE UNIVERSITY OF
NOTRE DAME
AUSTRALIA

Policy:
Student Feedback

Effective: 11 July 2019

Audience: Staff and Students

Policy Category: Governance
Policy Sub-category: Quality Assurance

Key words:	student feedback, quality assurance
Policy Owner:	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic
Responsible Officer:	Director, Quality Management Office
Review Date:	September 2022

Contents

1   OBJECTS OF THE UNIVERSITY

The University's Objects are defined in Section 5 of its Act of Parliament:

In pursuing these Objects, the University seeks to be an outstanding Australian university, and one of the best Catholic universities in the world.

The Objects of the University are:

(a) the provision of university education, within a context of Catholic faith and values; and
(b) the provision of an excellent standard of -
      i.   teaching, scholarship and research;
      ii.   training for the professions; and
      iii.   pastoral care for its students.

2   PURPOSE

2.1   The University of Notre Dame Australia (**'University'**) values and actively seeks feedback from Students and about Students with the intention of supporting openness, responsiveness, and improving the Student Experience and Outcomes. The intent of this Policy is to articulate the University's approach to the systematic collection, analysis, reporting and use of feedback from and about Students, derived from the main institutional Student Feedback mechanisms.

3   SCOPE

3.1   This Policy applies to all Students including those enrolled in Non-award Programs and Programs delivered on behalf of the University by third parties.

3.2   This Policy does not apply to Vocational Education and Training (VET) qualifications and Units of Competency.

4   PRINCIPLES

4.1   Students should have an opportunity to provide feedback on their experiences and the outcomes of their studies at the University.

4.2   Employer views (and those of other relevant stakeholders) form an important source of feedback about the readiness, skill attainment, and overall quality of Students.

4.3   Participation in providing Student Feedback should be voluntary, anonymous and/or confidential, on a clearly communicated informed basis, and in accordance with Australian privacy laws and University procedures and processes.

4.4   The University employs a range of mechanisms to gather Student Feedback, including but not limited to :

    4.4.1   qualitative feedback through informal processes such as face to face interactions, Student focus groups, elected Student representatives or through committees or other activities in which Students are involved;

4.4.2 summative evaluations of learning and teaching approved by the Vice Chancellor or Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic;

4.4.3 University-level and sector-wide surveys approved by Government, peak bodies, or the Vice Chancellor;

4.4.4 discipline-specific Student surveys managed by professional or industry associations; customised surveys, including those used to gather feedback on specific delivery modes including (but not limited to) Student internships, clinical placements or field trips;

4.4.5 progress reports for Students undertaking a Program with a Major Research Component; and

4.4.6 formal Student complaint/grievance processes.

4.5 The range of main institutional-level mechanisms used to gather Student Feedback by the University is summarised in Appendix 1.

4.6 Other customised surveys for more localised usage in gathering Student Feedback, which are not specified in *Appendix 1*, are subject to an approval process via QMO and reviewed by the University's legal department as required, prior to use.

4.7 The University will gather and report on Student Feedback at various levels, using processes which are consistent with the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015*.

4.8 Collecting and is an important means of enhancing the quality of the Student Experience and Outcomes. Student Feedback will be used to inform:

4.8.1 improvements to the quality of Programs and Courses;

4.8.2 enhancement of curriculum and assessment design;

4.8.3 improvements to learning resources, facilities, equipment and services;

4.8.4 benchmarking activities;

4.8.5 the scholarship of teaching and learning;

4.8.6 professional development and other capacity-building strategies across the University;

4.8.7 evidence for teaching quality in Staff appointment and promotion processes, and for internal and external teaching awards;

4.8.8 evidence-based reporting, including the University's annual Program monitoring process; and

4.8.9 Teaching staff and their supervisors should have opportunities to review feedback by students on their teaching and research supervision.

4.9 Responding to Student Feedback by Closing the Feedback Loop is an important and expected step in Student Feedback processes and evidence of actions/improvements will be communicated to Students.

4.10 Each mechanism used to gather Student Feedback will not be used in isolation to evaluate the Student Experience and Outcomes.

5   ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1   **QMO** has responsibility for:

   5.1.1   promoting core surveys to engage Students in the feedback process by making the existence, purpose, timing, and use of the main feedback mechanisms (A*ppendix 1)* known directly to Students or enlisting assistance from within or external to the University;

   5.1.2   considering the range and frequency of approved Student surveys that are centrally controlled in order to minimise survey fatigue and unnecessary duplication;

   5.1.3   ensuring ethical procedures and confidentiality of Student information are upheld and regularly assessed;

   5.1.4   maintaining all survey data compliant with relevant legislation and survey methodology;

   5.1.5   maintaining a register of approved surveys; and

   5.1.6   providing information, guidance and support to both staff and Students when required.

5.2   **Research Office Directors** have responsibility for coordinating, monitoring, reviewing, acting on, and reporting on the main feedback mechanisms which involve aspects of the Student Experience and Outcomes relevant to research.

5.3   **Students and other stakeholders** have responsibility (if providing feedback) for:

   5.3.1   contributing constructive, honest and thoughtful feedback;

   5.3.2   providing feedback which is not derogatory or vindictive; and

   5.3.3   recognising their important role in contributing to improvements in learning, teaching, research where applicable, and the broader Student Experience and Outcomes.

5.4   **Teaching staff and Supervisors** have responsibility for:

   5.4.1   encouraging Students and other stakeholders to participate in feedback processes;

   5.4.2   engaging with Student Feedback and actively responding, where possible, to improving the quality of learning, teaching, research where applicable, and the broader Student Experience and Outcomes;

   5.4.3   maintaining their own personal records of feedback, with due regard for the confidentiality of the data;

   5.4.4   ensuring confidentiality and ethical procedures are upheld; and

   5.4.5   reflecting upon Student Feedback to provide information, guidance and support to students for enhancing their learning.

5.5   **Dean of School** (or equivalent) is responsible for:

   5.5.1   closing the Feedback Loop for Students by conveying via a variety of means, how the feedback gathered has been used to effect changes and or improvements;

   5.5.2   communicating outcomes as appropriate, to other relevant stakeholders; and

   5.5.3   acting on feedback to support improvements to teaching and research supervision performance.

5.6 **Heads of support areas involved with the Student Experience** (and Outcomes where relevant) have a responsibility to utilise applicable Student Feedback to inform priorities for improvement of facilities, administration, and Student services.

6   RELATED DOCUMENTS

This Policy must be read and applied in reference to the following University documents:

6.1   *The University of Notre Dame Australia Statutes* [section 42]

6.2   *The University of Notre Dame Australia Regulation: General Regulations*

6.3   *Procedure: Teaching Performance and Course Content Evaluations*

6.4   *Policy: Course Outlines* and *Course Outline Template*

6.5   *Policy: Vice Chancellor Awards*

6.6   *Procedure: Student Grievance*

6.7   *Procedure: Higher Education Program Monitoring, Review and Re-accreditation*

7   DEFINITIONS

7.1   **For the purpose of this Policy, the following definitions apply*:***

Closing the Feedback Loop means the process of letting those who have provided requested feedback know how this feedback (usually in generalised terms) has been used.

Program with a Major Research Component means a program of study that involves conduct of research leading to a thesis/dissertation which is a major component of the overall Program requirements (that is comprising two-thirds or more of the student load). Examples include Master Degree (Research); Master of Philosophy; Doctor of Philosophy; and Professional Doctoral Degrees.

Non-award Program is a Program offered by the University that does not lead to a recognised AQF qualification and includes foundation year Courses, Tertiary Enabling Programs and University Certificates.

QMO means the Fremantle and/or Sydney branch of the Quality Management Office.

Student means a person enrolled in a Program (including a Non-award Program) or Course at the University (including those delivered on behalf of the University by third parties) and includes a Student who has (graduated from or) received an academic award or degree on completion of their studies at the University.

Student Experience and Outcomes means engagement, perception, satisfaction levels of current Students primarily in relation to learning, teaching, and research. For Students who have graduated from the University, this also includes employment and other outcomes.

Student Feedback means solicited evaluation by Students or about Students on any aspect of the Student Experience and Outcomes.

Unit of Competency is the specification and application of knowledge and skill to the standard of performance expected in the workplace. It is the smallest unit that can be assessed and recognised in endorsed components of Vocational Education and Training (VET) training packages.

University means The University of Notre Dame Australia.

Reference to other defined terms or University staff titles not outlined in this Policy, have the same definition prescribed in the University *General Regulations* or *Statutes*.

Version	Date of approval	Approved by	Amendment
1	11 March 2015	Vice Chancellor	Effective date – new Policy.
2	11 July 2019	DVC, Academic	Minor amendments - updated nomenclature, reformatted to new Policy template, appendix updated to accurately reflect current survey/feedback instruments.

Appendix 1: Schedule of main institutional Student Feedback mechanisms

Feedback Mechanism	Feedback Type	Feedback Group	Administration	Mode	Frequency	Approximate Timing	Brief Description	Uses of Information Collected	Reporting/Communication
Teaching Performance Evaluation (TPE)	Institutional Survey	Current Students, apart from those studying in a Program with a major research component	QMO	Paper & some online	Biannual and according to specified schedule - Refer to *Procedure: Teaching Performance and Course Content Evaluations*	At conclusion of teaching period/Course duration	Notre Dame's customised evaluation instrument used by current Students to provide summative evaluation feedback on the quality of teaching at the University.	• Inform School, Campus, institutional quality monitoring and improvement cycles for teaching . • Inform follow-up and letters of recognition processes for teaching performance. • Act as a source of evidence for teaching quality for the purposes of appointment, promotion, internal and external teaching awards. • Inform planning for academic professional development.	**QMO will:** • prepare individual diagnostic style report for each teacher evaluated and the Dean/equivalent; • prepare School TPE aggregations for the Dean; • prepare comparative TPE institutional, Campus, College, School level graphs for the Dean; • prepare TPE time series report at institutional, Campus, College and School levels for Vice Chancellor, Executive Council, and Academic Council. **The Dean will:** • be responsible for the follow-up/review process with the relevant Teaching staff member where the unit mean rating has fallen below the University's required minimum performance standard, or for commending performance standards in line with *Procedure: Teaching Performance and Course Content Evaluations.*
Course Content Evaluation (CCE)	Institutional Survey	Current Students, apart from those undertaking a Course which is part of a Program with a major research component	QMO	Paper & some online	Biannual and according to specified schedule - Refer to *Procedure: Teaching Performance and Course Content Evaluations*	At conclusion of teaching period/Course duration	Notre Dame's customised evaluation instrument used by current Students to provide summative evaluation feedback on the quality of Course content at the University.	• Inform School, Campus, institutional quality monitoring and improvement cycles for Courses. • Inform planning for academic professional development.	**QMO will:** • prepare individual diagnostic style report on each Course evaluated for the Dean/equivalent and Course Coordinator;
Student Experience Survey (SES)	National Survey	Australian commencing and later-year, onshore, undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students. Enabling students are included as an additional population.	QMO and Social Research Centre on behalf of the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.	Online	Annual	Mid-year	SES focuses on aspects of the Student Experience that are measurable, linked with learning and development outcomes, and potentially able to be influenced by institutions. SES is part of the *Quality Indicators for Learning & Teaching* (QILT) suite of surveys.	• Designed to provide reliable, valid and generalizable information to the Australian Government and to universities (e.g.) informing ongoing institutional improvement, monitoring and planning. • Transparency of information to students. • Marketing	**QMO will:** • prepare institutional report for Vice Chancellor, Executive Council, Academic Council, Academic Staff Marketing & Communication Office; • prepare study area level reports for Deans. **The Dean will:** . close the Feedback Loop/communicating to Students and relevant stakeholders, evidence of actions resulting from SES feedback.

Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS)	**National Survey**	Australian Higher Education Graduates (Undergraduate, Postgraduate coursework and Postgraduate research)	QMO and Social Research Centre on behalf of the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.	Online	Annual	Mid-year completers surveyed November of same year. End-of-year completers surveyed May following year	GOS measures the destinations (employment, further study outcomes) and satisfaction of recent higher education graduates. GOS is part of the *Quality Indicators for Learning & Teaching* (QILT) suite of surveys.	• Inform decision-making & processes at various levels in relation to course quality. • Benchmark with similar institutions and against national data. • Marketing	**QMO will:** • prepare institutional report for Vice Chancellor, Executive Council, Academic Council, Academic Staff, Marketing & Communication Office; • prepare study area level reports for Deans. **The Program Coordinator will:** • respond to the GOS indicators as part of Program Monitoring and Reporting Process **The Dean will:** • respond to the GOS indicators as part of School planning and reporting processes.
Graduate Outcomes Survey – Longitudinal (GOS-L)	**National Survey**	Australian Higher Education Graduates (Undergraduate, Postgraduate coursework and Postgraduate research)	QMO and the Social Research Centre on behalf of the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.	Online	Annual	Feb/March about 3 years after Program completion	GOS-L provides information on the medium-term outcomes of higher education graduates, based on cohort analysis of graduates who respond to the GOS. GOS-L is part of the *Quality Indicators for Learning & Teaching* (QILT) suite of surveys.	• Benchmark with similar institutions and against national data.	**QMO will:** • prepare institutional report for Vice Chancellor, Executive Council, Academic Council, Academic Staff, Marketing & Communication Office; • if these is sufficient data, prepare College/School level reports for Deans.
Employer Satisfaction Survey (ESS)	**National Survey**	Employers and supervisors of recent Australian higher education graduates	QMO and the Social Research Centre on behalf of the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.	Online	Annual	May - July	ESS directly links the experiences of graduates to the views of their direct supervisors. ESS provides information about the quality of education provided at Australian institutions, by asking supervisors to provide feedback about the generic skills, technical skills and work readiness of the graduate employed in their work. ESS is part of the *Quality Indicators for Learning & Teaching* (QILT) suite of surveys.place.	• Marketing	**QMO will:** • prepare institutional report for Vice Chancellor, Executive Council, Academic Council, Academic Staff, Marketing & Communication Office; • if these is sufficient data, prepare College/School level reports for Deans.
Supervisor and Research Student Expectation Questionnaire	**Institutional Survey**	Higher Degree by Research (HDR) student HDR Supervisor/s	Research Offices	Paper	Given to individual Student and Supervisor/s at The commencement of research candidacy meeting	Submitted by individual Student at first mid-year progress report meeting	Gauges the quality and expectations of the Student- Supervisor relationship	• Identify areas for improvement and communication	**Research Offices will:** • prepare institutional report/s, as required, for Pro Vice Chancellor, Research, Research Committee, Executive Council, Academic Council.
Research Student Progress Report	**Institutional Report**	HDR Students HDR Supervisor/s	Research Offices	Paper	Each Semester if status is conditional. And annually for all students.	End of Semester or as relevant	Progress report completed by Student, Supervisor/s, Dean, Pro Vice Chancellor - Research; the main aim is for these contributors to assess academic progress. It also provides an opportunity for Students to provide confidential feedback on the	• Follow-up on any supervision/academic issues which emerge. • ILevel of resourcing of administrative services in support of Student research.	**Research Offices will:** • use the outcomes of reporting to inform the Board of Examiners.

						quality of supervision and the quality of Research Office support.		