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Introduction

Evaluation is considered an integral part of the education process within the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences and is overseen by the Faculty Evaluation Committee on behalf of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee.

Course evaluation is about collecting, analysing and utilising information gained from students, staff and course developers so that decisions are made in an evidence-based manner. Evaluation seeks to determine how well the educational needs of students have been met and whether educational standards have been attained.

Evaluation of the health professional courses, Medicine, Dental Science, Podiatric Medicine, Nursing Science, Pharmacy and Social Work assesses the educational quality of the courses at different points. Curricula then can be updated and modified from information provided by the course stakeholders.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee was reformed in 2010 after a review of evaluation within the Faculty. The committee invites students, teachers, and course developers to become partners in evaluation – to take part in the ongoing cycle of curriculum development and improvement for the benefit of future students.

Participants are invited to give honest and considered feedback and in return evaluation reports will be provided that not only provide information, but more importantly propose actions for change. The committee wishes for the information to be gathered systematically and the results put to good use.

This document provides information for the stakeholders concerned with one of the health professional courses. A brief background to the Faculty, the purpose of evaluation and the management of evaluation for the faculty courses, including the differing roles and responsibilities of those involved, is given to provide both a strategic plan and framework for evaluation within the Faculty.

Updated by Assistant Professor Sue Miller
Chair, Evaluation Committee
November 2014
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Our goal is to establish an evaluation process that is visible, responsive, collaborative and useful; to enable a dynamic response to curriculum delivery and improvements within a positive educational culture of information and change.

Our objectives are to:
- work towards best practice in evaluation
- use evaluation findings for facilitating change
- continuously communicate and collaborate with all stakeholders
Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences

Mission
The Faculty mission is to provide education, service and research that creates better health for the benefit of the West Australian, Australian and International community. Implicit in this statement is an acknowledgement of the rights and needs of Indigenous peoples.

The Faculty vision is to provide inspiration for the next generation of health professionals and health educators through the promotion, implementation and delivery of medical, dental, and health sciences education, health service and all aspects of health-related research at the highest standards of international excellence.

In relation to Indigenous health, all graduates of the School need to demonstrate a working knowledge of the historical, geographical and socio-cultural context of health care for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and an ability to plan and provide care to Indigenous patients in a comprehensive, multidisciplinary culturally secure context.

Our priorities are to:

- Promote teaching and learning to the highest international standards.
- Contribute to culturally safe health-care and health-care practice.
- Increase understanding, prevention and effective management of disease.
- Develop knowledge in the biomedical and health sciences within the multi-dimensional views of health.
Courses in the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences - Health Professional Programs

The Faculty has a number of graduate entry health professional courses: Medicine, Dental Science, Podiatric Medicine, Nursing Science, Pharmacy and Social Work. Three undergraduate courses are currently offered in Medicine, Dental Science and Podiatric Medicine. These courses are gradually coming being taught out.

Medicine

The six-year undergraduate medical course is taught by the various schools in the Faculty and by disciplines in the Faculty of Physical and Life Sciences. From 2015, there will be two year levels to complete the course – Year 5 and 6.

The Doctor of Medicine (MD) is a four-year graduate entry course that commenced in 2014.

Dental Science

This five-year Bachelor of Dental Science program is taught by the School of Dentistry. In 2015, there will be one year level to complete the course – Year 5.

The Doctor of Dental Medicine (DMD) is a four-year graduate entry course that commenced in 2013.

Podiatric Medicine

The Doctor of Podiatric Medicine (DPD) is a three-year graduate entry course that commenced in 2013.

Master of Nursing Science (entry-to-practice)

This two calendar year Master of Nursing Science (entry-to-practice) program is coordinated by the School of Population Health and is taught by various schools within the Faculty.

Master of Pharmacy

This two calendar year Master of Pharmacy program is coordinated by the School of Medicine and Pharmacology.

Master of Social Work

This two-year Master of Social Work program is coordinated by the School of Population Health.
Faculty Course Management - Committees: Structure and Responsibilities

Faculty Board
The Faculty Board has the delegated powers of the Faculty and is the Faculty’s major decision-making committee. The Faculty Board is responsible to the Faculty for the conduct of all Faculty business relating to research, teaching and academic structures and processes and advises on matters of resources. Membership includes the Dean, Deputy Dean and the Associate Deans, Heads of Schools and representatives from each of the teaching disciplines. There is also student representation from all undergraduate student associations and a post-graduate student representative. Faculty Board meetings are normally held on the second Tuesday of the month and Full Faculty meetings are held twice a year and are open to all staff of Faculty.

Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee
The Teaching and Learning Committee is chaired by the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning). Its function is to provide a forum for communication between senior staff responsible for leading the teaching and learning across the Faculty. It also provides a forum for discussion of strategies to improve the quality of teaching and learning using Faculty and University derived evaluation data. The committee is the main forum for transmission and dissemination of information from the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee to faculty stakeholders. It provides support and direction on evaluation by reviewing, providing a response and making decisions on items to do with evaluation and course improvement that have been brought to the committee’s attention by the evaluation committee.

Faculty Evaluation Committee
The Faculty Evaluation Committee is a sub-committee of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. The Evaluation Committee undertakes evaluation of the Faculty’s health professional courses. It facilitates decision-making in the design of the curricula and monitors and evaluates the effect of curricular change on student experience of learning and attainment of learning outcomes. It also facilitates and encourages the process of evaluation at an individual unit level in order to increase understanding of teaching and learning. It provides guidance and direction on the evaluation activities, undertakes the course evaluation, and provides a report to and highlights items needing attention to the Teaching and Learning Committee and carries out that committee’s decisions (see Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference).

Course Curriculum/Program Committees
The course curriculum committee is the group with responsibility for managing their specific course. It is the policy and decision making body of that course's teaching and learning in the Faculty. It is also responsible for the review of curriculum. It seeks input from reporting committees in the domains of evaluation, Year Committees (if applicable), as well as from any working parties and regular reports from the student society/association representatives. It provides a written response to the Evaluation Committee on the course evaluation results, including plans for action.

Year Committees - Medicine and Dentistry
The role of the Year Committees is to review the integration of the medical or dental curriculum, for their particular year, and undertake areas of curriculum development. Specific functions include:

- review of current materials taught throughout that year;
- establish integration between outcomes and assessment;
- provide written actioned responses to evaluation to the evaluation committee;
- incorporate innovative assessment measures as appropriate;
- consider issues of student concern; and
- ensure well-defined and transparent assessment protocols, including a plan of action for remediation.
Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences Committee Structure
Evaluation for the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences

What is Evaluation?
Evaluation is considered an integral part of the education process within the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences. All academic communities should operate a plan-do-evaluate-act cycle to ensure high quality, well targeted teaching and learning opportunities.¹

Evaluation can be described as the systematic approach to collecting, providing and utilising information about an educational course or program to determine the nature, quality and efficiency of the teaching and learning in that course or program. Evaluation is the basis for quality improvement and assurance.

Evaluation is necessary to ensure ongoing relevance, coherence, balance, and progression within a curriculum. Furthermore, the evaluation process provides an evidence base for subsequent judgement and decision-making on curriculum development and revision. An educational curriculum should continually develop in response to the needs of the students, staff, institution and society. Evaluation can monitor the curriculum and should be viewed as a positive process that enables the strategic development, implementation and maintenance of a quality academic course or program.

Purposes of Evaluation
There are many purposes of evaluation. Evaluation can be conceptualised in terms of curriculum, teaching and learning, assessment and policy (Box 1). The focus for evaluation is often centred on the curriculum, either in its development or maintenance, and teaching and learning. However, evaluation can be used to examine assessment tools and strategies and determine faculty policy in curriculum and teaching and learning.

## Box 1: Purposes of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate curriculum development</td>
<td>To ensure teaching is meeting students' learning needs</td>
<td>To assess the outcome of assessments</td>
<td>To determine future faculty education policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure curriculum outcomes are achieved</td>
<td>To identify areas where teaching can be modified/improved</td>
<td>To appraise the development and use of assessment tools</td>
<td>To encourage instilling education values and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform the efficient allocation of teaching and learning resources</td>
<td>To provide feedback and encouragement to teachers and the faculty</td>
<td>To monitor the appropriateness of assessment strategies</td>
<td>To provide surveillance of course/program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the course is of acceptable standard</td>
<td>To support applications for promotion and career development by teachers</td>
<td>(Adapted from Wall 2010, p 337)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Wall 2010, p 337)²
Conceptual Models and Frameworks in Evaluation

The evaluation process should be planned at the start of developing a curriculum or learning experience and not added as an afterthought. Conceptual models and frameworks can help to assist our understanding of curriculum evaluation and that information from feedback is a driver of change.

1. Evaluation Cycle

Evaluation is a continuous process or cycle of educational quality improvement\(^3\) rather than a research question to be answered. A model of the evaluation cycle is often used as presented in figure 6. Fundamental to this process is establishing clear course learning outcomes and the learning environment associated with teaching and learning around which evaluation can be constructed, data analysed and recommendations made. Once the changes are made in the curriculum, the process can start again.

![Evaluation Cycle Diagram](image)

Figure 6: The Evaluation Cycle

2. Task-oriented Evaluation Model

The task-oriented model of program evaluation consists of five steps or tasks\(^4\) (Box 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2: Task-oriented model of program evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Examine the evaluation need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Why are you doing it, and for whom?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Determine the evaluation focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What is to be evaluated?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Determine the evaluation methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*When, where, how to be done and what analyses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Present the evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Who are the key stakeholders to receive results, and when should these be presented?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Document the evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>How will the results be documented and used for program improvement?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Kirkpatrick’s Hierarchy of Program Evaluation

Kirkpatrick has described four levels of evaluation of program outcomes. These four levels have been adapted for use in health professional education evaluation\(^5,6\). At the base (the lowest level) is learners’ satisfaction or reaction with the course/program, followed by the modification of attitudes and perceptions, the knowledge and skills gained, the changes in health professionals’ behaviours or practice, the change in the institution’s practice, and finally, at the top of the hierarchy, health care outcomes. Course evaluation should start with the first level. However, unfortunately, many educational evaluations are only at the lower levels of the hierarchy.

![Kirkpatrick’s hierarchy for health professional education evaluation](image)

**Figure 7**: Kirkpatrick’s hierarchy for health professional education evaluation (Adapted from Barr et al 2000; Belfield et al 2001\(^5,6\))

Course evaluation also applies at all levels. At each level the relevant stakeholders views should be sought to inform the curriculum, including those students who have exited the course.

![Levels of course evaluation](image)

**Figure 8**: Levels of course evaluation

The aim of evaluation of the curriculum is to assess the adequacy of the processes surrounding curriculum implementation and establishment; identify the impact of the curriculum upon students and graduates and compare the new and old curricula.

Evaluation therefore needs to be carried out in four main areas:
- **Processes** surrounding the curriculum implementation and curriculum design
- **Content** of the curriculum and teaching methods used
- **Impact** through assessment of student performance
- **Outcomes** via performance of graduates in the community.
Evaluation Policy - Looking forward to the future
Planning evaluation to be a process that is visible, responsive, collaborative and useful is the goal of the Faculty’s Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation Committee is and will continue to review the evaluation processes in collaboration with stakeholders, with the view to preparing the Faculty to be able to use the evaluation processes across the new graduate courses. We wish to enable a dynamic response to curriculum change and improvements within a positive educational culture of information and change. The Faculty aims for consistent delivery of the curriculum irrespective of course or year level or geographical location.

Our objectives are to:
• work towards best practice in evaluation
• use evaluation findings for facilitating change
• continuously communicate and collaborate with all stakeholders.

The committee invites students, teachers, and course developers to take part in the ongoing cycle of curriculum development and improvement for the benefit of future students. Various other activities and evaluation strategies are planned for the future alongside the course evaluation.

The Evaluation framework will be based on the University of New South Wales’ evaluation matrix. It includes four domains:
1. The Student Experience
2. Student and Graduate Outcomes
3. Staff and Teaching
4. Curriculum and Resources
In each domain there is a set of key quality indicators for which the key data collection methods have been identified (see Appendix 2).

Evaluation Policy – Process and Responsibilities
Within the service role the evaluation committee will conduct evaluation to assist in course development and curriculum revision, working with all stakeholders to ensure representation of all views. The Evaluation Committee aims to create a strategic, rigorous, relevant evaluation program, using a variety of methods, to improve curriculum, and inclusive of and of benefit to all stakeholders.

Course evaluation is required for all health professional courses in the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences. This includes continuous whole of course and year level evaluation of student and staff perceptions of course processes, content and outcomes. Course evaluation should also collect evaluation data on specific areas of the curriculum and other relevant stakeholders, respond to the issues raised, make changes where appropriate and correlate to university and unit level evaluation.

Unit level evaluation is strongly recommended by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Committee will provide advice and support but does not conduct unit level evaluation.
The Evaluation Policy encompasses the following:

1. The Dean, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences authorises the Faculty Evaluation Committee on behalf of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee to carry out course evaluation for the health professional courses, utilise other evaluation data as provided by the university, and commission specific evaluation information as required. This information will be used to provide an annual written report on each course, identify trends in course evaluation results and provide feedback to students and other stakeholders.

2. The Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee will receive evaluation information and reports. It will on the behalf of the Dean, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences make decisions about the curriculum based on evaluation evidence and will formulat a response to issues that are brought to the committee’s attention by the Evaluation Committee in collaboration with the course director.

Responsibilities of the Faculty’s Evaluation Committee include evaluation of all the teaching programs within the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences. The terms of reference are included in Appendix 1. Activities include:

- Course quality is evaluated through the Faculty’s Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course. The survey is administered to each course annually during the teaching period. The course evaluation survey covers a number of elements including student perception of attainment of year-specific learning outcomes, faculty generic outcomes, teaching and learning, assessment, feedback and overall satisfaction.
- Additional evaluations are tailored on request for each course.
- Graduating students complete an online ‘Exit Survey’ which deals broadly with course quality.
- Feedback from student association surveys, university-level unit evaluation (SURF, CEQ, GDS), focus group discussions and emails.

3. The Evaluation Committee reports directly to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee and feeds back information to the course curriculum committees.

4. In response to the course evaluation results, the curriculum committees of the respective courses will be requested to submit written reports that respond to the evaluation results. Action points regarding changes to be made in response to the evaluation data are to be provided by the relevant curriculum committee chair in a timely manner.

5. Compulsory on-line evaluation is centrally coordinated for every unit in the University using the Student Unit Reflective Feedback (SURF) on-line survey. These results are immediately available to unit coordinators for review and action. At the end of each semester these results are reviewed by the Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor, the Dean and the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) and unit coordinators are contacted directly to discuss problems that are identified and to be congratulated where units are performing extremely well. Relevant results are also forwarded to each Head of School and are discussed by the Year Committees.

6. Teaching staff are encouraged to use the Student Perceptions of Teaching survey, commonly referred to as SPOT. It is an evaluation instrument designed to provide feedback to teachers about their teaching. The questionnaire is structured to enable student feedback to be obtained on specific aspects of an individual’s teaching. The survey has 12 standard items with two open ended comment questions. Three survey types are available; one primarily for teaching (lecturing) one for tutoring (including lab demonstrating) and one for team teaching,
which provides an aggregated evaluation for all members of a teaching team. The list of SPOT items is provided in Appendix 4. The SPOT office can be found at http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/etu/spot

**Audience and Stakeholders**

The Evaluation Committee has identified the following as stakeholders in the medical curriculum:

- Students and recent graduates
- Individual Teaching Staff (UWA and non-UWA)
- Unit coordinators
- Curriculum Committees & Year Committees
- External Review Bodies (eg AMC)
- External organisations (including employers) & clinicians
- Members of the community, including patients

**Data Collection Methods**

Various methods will be used to assess the adequacy of the curriculum. Examples of these methods include:

- Surveys/Questionnaires (paper-based & on-line)
  - Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course (SETC – Old Course SPOT)
  - Student Evaluation of Teaching and Unit
  - Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT)
  - Student Unit Reflection Feedback (SURF)
  - Student Association Surveys
- Focus groups
- Interviews
- Site visits
- Peer review
- Self-evaluation
- Debriefing sessions

(Refer to Appendix 2 to see how these methods fit into the evaluation framework)

**Evaluation Results – Dissemination to the Stakeholders**

To be meaningful, evaluation outcomes need to be acted upon to make improvements. This requires feeding back the data to stakeholders, to ‘close the loop’ on the evaluation cycle. Also effective communication between key stakeholders is important, so as to define what “quality” means, and to provide feedback and standards about important aspects of quality.

The Evaluation and Policy and Procedures Manual will be circulated to all Curriculum Committees, including year committees where applicable, on an annual basis so as to remind the members of the Faculty’s evaluation requirements. This will occur just prior to the beginning of the academic year and again in August. The Evaluation Policy and Procedures manual will also go directly to all unit coordinators on a biannual basis.

The Evaluation Committee will prepare a report on the evaluation results of each course. A list of recommendations and proposed changes will be provided within the report to address evaluation
issues that arise. The relevant curriculum committee will be required to contribute to this process by examining the results and providing a written response and the action plan. The final reports will be circulated to all relevant committees, placed on the Evaluation webpage within the faculty and distributed to the relevant student associations. The reports are to be discussed at the relevant curriculum committee meetings and a follow up brief report will be requested from the committees on action to be taken and later the progress that has been made.

Dissemination to stakeholders can also take the following forms:

- Discuss with students the changes made due to previous evaluations and changes as a result
- Publish student feedback – via reports, and placed in unit guidebooks and on websites
- Information about previous evaluation feedback and the changes being made is incorporated into the unit guidebook (and the positives; not just that needing change)
- Begin the first lecture by highlighting unit feedback received and actions/improvements taken
- Explain why you might not be making changes and find ways to align staff and student expectations
- Communicate during annual reviews of units the changes you have made – feedback is not just to students but to peers and stakeholders.
Course Evaluation – Evaluation Cycle & Stakeholder Responsibilities

The diagram below uses the evaluation cycle model to illustrate the operational tasks undertaken by the Evaluation committee in the course evaluation process. Once the data has been collected, processed and analysed, the relevant course committees will be asked to provide a written plan of action for change in response to the evaluation information. The final report with these actions of change will be included in the final report.

The Chair, of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee will meet with the director of a course in the event that no written action plans have been forwarded to the relevant curriculum committee or no action was carried out to address issues that have arisen through evaluation. The director will be required to outline the reasons for this and a resolution will be formulated with the Chair.

Figure 9: Course Evaluation – Evaluation Cycle & Responsibilities
Course Evaluation Timeline
For each course the evaluation cycle timeline would be along the following lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Evaluation Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>• Course evaluation tools reviewed and tabled at Evaluation Committee meeting for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September - October</td>
<td>• Complete course evaluation surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>• Data entry of course evaluation data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| November         | • Preliminary quantitative results tabled at the Evaluation Committee  
                      • Report Writing                                                                                                                              |
| December         | • Report Writing                                                                                                                                      |
| January - February | • Preliminary results report sent to Chair, Curriculum/Year Committees  
                      • Chair to obtain feedback                                                                                                                      |
| March            | • Final Report tabled at Evaluation Committee meeting for ratification                                                                            |
| March            | • Final Report tabled at Teaching and Learning Committee meeting for ratification                                                                  |
| April            | • Final Reports sent to Curriculum/Year Committees to table at committee meetings                                                                  |
| May              | • Chair, Curriculum/Year Committee to forward a written response to the Evaluation Committee                                                         |
| June             | • Committee written responses tabled at Evaluation Committee                                                                                      |
| June             | • Committee written responses tabled at Teaching and Learning Committee                                                                          |
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APPENDIX 1: Faculty Evaluation Committee – Terms of Reference (2014)

Evaluation is an essential process for ongoing monitoring of the curriculum content and the quality of teaching and student outcomes. To be meaningful, evaluation outcomes need to be acted upon to make improvements. This requires feeding back the data to stakeholders to “close the loop” on the evaluation cycle.

Evaluation is being carried out extensively throughout the Faculty, often to a high standard, these good practices should be extended more broadly and the data should be utilised. To maximise the effectiveness of course evaluation, a centralised coordinated approach will be required to capture and utilise all available information.

The Evaluation Committee is responsible to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. The Evaluation Committee communicates and works with the following committees for the purpose of overseeing evaluation in the medical, dental science, podiatric medicine, nursing science, pharmacy and social work curricula:

Medical Curriculum Committee
MD Curriculum Content Committee
Dental Curriculum Committee
DMD Committee
Podiatric Medicine Curriculum Committee
Master of Nursing Science Curriculum Committee
Pharmacy Curriculum Committee
Social Work & Social Policy Curriculum Working Party

1. Role of the Evaluation Committee
   a. To develop and adopt a comprehensive and coordinated approach towards evaluation across the Faculty utilising an Evaluation Matrix identifying evaluation processes for a 5 year cycle.

   b. To undertake process, impact and outcome evaluation of the courses named above in the Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences so as to facilitate in administrative decision making regarding the design of the curricula and monitor and evaluate the effect of curricular change on student experience of learning and attainment of learning outcomes.

   c. To facilitate and encourage the process of evaluation at individual unit level to increase understanding of teaching and learning.

   d. To document collected evidence of evaluation and disseminate summarised results from evaluation activities to the Teaching and Learning Committee and to undergraduate and graduate Course level Curriculum Committees for Medicine, Podiatric Medicine, Nursing, Dental Science, Pharmacy and Social Work.

   e. To facilitate, document and disseminate curriculum committee responses to evaluation data and if required make recommendations for future evaluation activities.

   f. To liaise with the wider University Community on evaluation related areas.

   g. To liaise with and compare evaluation processes with other Universities as required.
2. **Role of the Chair and Executive Officer**
   
a. The Chair of the Committee reports directly to the Chair of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee on evaluation activities and highlights areas for consideration.

b. The Chair of the Committee in consultation with the committee is responsible for planning evaluation activities and coordinating collection of evaluation data and reporting findings.

c. Chair and Executive Officer are responsible for ensuring the rules for the operation of committees are followed including the appropriate recording of decisions and actions.

d. Chair should ensure meetings are conducted fluently so that resolutions are clear and try to ensure the active participation by all members of the committee.

e. Chairs and Executive Officer should meet to discuss the agenda, distribute the agenda 3 days prior to the meeting and record and disseminate the outcomes/minutes of the meeting within 10 business days.

3. **Role of the Membership**
   
a. Members are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the University’s Code of Conduct and the University Committee Members’ Code of Conduct. [http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/commconst/university committee_members_code_of_conduct](http://www.secretariat.uwa.edu.au/home/policies/commconst/university committee_members_code_of_conduct)

b. Members are required to participate actively in committee business and provide appropriate contributions to decision making.

c. Members who represent constituents on a committee should make every attempt to canvass the views and opinion of that group to bring back to the discussion of the committee and report committee decisions back to their constituents.

d. Members facilitate the collection of evaluation information within their school or discipline, assist with documentation of findings, disseminate evaluation reports and gather relevant curriculum committee or school level responses to evaluation data.

e. Where a member’s attendance is not possible, a named proxy is required to attend in their absence with at least two days’ notice to the Chair and/or Executive Officer.

f. The Committee needs to have achieved quorum before decisions can be ratified.

4. **Membership**
   
a. Chair of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee

b. One Academic representative from each School of the Faculty

c. One Academic representative from Podiatric Medicine

d. One Academic representative from Nursing Science
e. One Academic representative from Pharmacy
f. One academic representative from Social Work & Social Policy
g. One student representative (Medicine)
h. One student representative (Dental Science)
i. One student representative (Podiatric Medicine)
j. One student representative (Pharmacy)
k. One student representative (Nursing Science)
l. One student representative (Social Work/Social Policy)
m. One Education Centre representative
n. Education Centre Administration Officer (Executive Officer)
o. One representative from the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning

Notes referring to membership

- Individual members may represent more than one committee.
- The appointment of a Chair and Deputy Chair is to be determined by the Chair of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee on the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee.
- The role of Chair will rotate usually every 2 years.
- Meetings shall be held at least four times per year.
- Student representatives to provide a report to the committee at each meeting.
- One third of members present will constitute a quorum.
- The committee can form smaller working groups to complete nominated tasks.
- Minutes of committee meetings will be circulated to the Chair of the Teaching and Learning Committee, Medical Curriculum Committee, MD Curriculum Content Committee, Dental Curriculum Committee, DMD Committee, Podiatric Medicine Curriculum Committee, Master of Nursing Science Curriculum Committee, Pharmacy and Social Work curriculum groups and other committee Chairs as appropriate.
# APPENDIX 2: Evaluation Framework
(Adapted from the University of New South Wales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Quality Aspects</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Key Quality Indicators</th>
<th>Current &amp; potential data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Experience (SE)</td>
<td>SE1.</td>
<td>1. Satisfaction with learning and teaching (includes activities)</td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – perception of satisfaction and quality - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Student perception of quality of learning &amp; teaching materials</td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – satisfaction with teaching and learning resources - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Student perception of quality of physical environment</td>
<td>✓ SURF – conclusion of unit/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Student perception of quality of learning culture</td>
<td>✓ Student Association Surveys – Various intervals throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE2.</td>
<td>5. Satisfaction with administration and support</td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – Support from teaching staff - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE3.</td>
<td>6. Quality of interactions and support</td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – ask year 1 students about their sense of belonging to the university - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE4.</td>
<td>7. Quality of admissions process</td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – sound introduction to course content in year 1 - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Satisfaction with transition</td>
<td>✓ First year experience survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Graduate Outcomes (SG)</td>
<td>SG1.</td>
<td>9. Assessment results profile</td>
<td>✓ Map cohort performance – assessment profile of cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Attitude to medicine/career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Progression patterns of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SG2. | Graduate capabilities | 12. External capability assessments  
13. Perceived self-efficacy (referenced to capabilities) | ✓ | Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – student perception of attainment of learning outcomes & generic outcomes - Yearly  
✓ | Preparedness to Practice (Medicine only – Yr 4 – Yr 6); Exit Surveys |
| SG3. | Career outcomes | 14. Paths, diversity, changes, and achievements of graduates | ✓ | Alumni Surveys; Graduate Destination Survey (GDS) |

| Staff and Teaching (ST) | ST1. Merit and capabilities | 15. Scholarship in teaching  
16. Program engagement and commitment | ✓ | Teaching portfolio; peer observation of teaching; Educational research; Professional education  
✓ | Year and unit level survey |
| ST2. Support, development, and recognition | 17. Career development, mentoring, and workload management  
18. Efficacy of incentive and recognition processes | ✓ | Peer observation of teaching; Teaching portfolio; workload formula; survey of academics |
| ST3. Quality of teaching | 19. Student satisfaction with learning and teaching  
20. Alignment of teaching, learning and assessment  
21. External assessments of quality of teaching | ✓ | Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – perception of satisfaction and quality - Yearly  
✓ | Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – Link between learning outcomes and assessment - Yearly  
✓ | SURF – conclusion of unit/year  
✓ | Student Association Surveys – Various intervals throughout the year  
✓ | Focus groups / interviews  
✓ | Specific projects on aspects of the curriculum |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Resources (CR)</th>
<th>CR1. Quality of curriculum design</th>
<th>22. Stakeholder judgements of quality of curriculum design</th>
<th>✓ Stakeholders – external educators; professional bodies (e.g. AMC); benchmarking with other universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23. Evaluation and improvement processes informing change</td>
<td>✓ Evaluation Policy and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Student Evaluation of Teaching and Course Survey – Link between learning outcomes and assessment - Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ SURF – conclusion of unit/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Assessment academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Audit of resources; survey of staff/students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25. Program engagement and commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR3.</td>
<td>Suitability of resources</td>
<td>26. Suitability of resources (physical, ICT; materials)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: Australian Medical Council - Standards - Monitoring and Evaluation

In the Australian Medical Council's *Assessment and Accreditation of Medical Schools: Standards and Procedures* monitoring and evaluation has the following standards:

**Ongoing Monitoring**

1. The school has ongoing monitoring procedures that review the curriculum content, quality of teaching, assessment and student progress, and identify and address concerns.
2. Teacher and student feedback is systematically sought, analysed and used as part of the monitoring process.
3. Teachers and students are actively involved in monitoring and in using the results for course development.

**Outcome Evaluation**

1. The performance of student cohorts is analysed in relation to the curriculum and the outcomes of the medical course.
2. Performance is analysed in relation to student background and entrance qualifications, and is used to provide feedback to the committees responsible for student selection, curriculum planning and student counselling.
3. The school evaluates the outcomes of the course in terms of postgraduate performance, career choice and career satisfaction.
4. Measures of, and information about, attributes of the graduates are used as feedback to course development.

**Feedback and Reporting**

1. The results of outcome evaluation are reported through the governance and administration of the medical school and to academic staff and students.
2. The medical school provides access to evaluation results to the full range of groups with an interest in graduate outcomes. The school considers the views of these groups on the relevance and development of the curriculum.

**Educational Exchanges**

1. The medical school collaborates with other educational institutions and compares its curriculum with other programs.
APPENDIX 4: Australian Dental Council – Accreditation Standards - Evaluation

**Standard 17 Evaluation procedures and outcomes**
The School must perform ongoing evaluation of the outcomes of its program to determine whether it is meeting its objectives. Results of the evaluation process must be used to improve the program.

**Evidence requirements**
Provide details of the evaluation processes used by the School to assess the quality of its teaching and learning programs, including outcome results.
Include:
- student evaluation of individual subjects
- student evaluation of the curriculum overall
- student evaluation of academic staff
- student evaluation of part-time tutors
- staff evaluation of students
- peer review of teaching (PET)
- external examiners reports
- course experience questionnaires (CEQs)
- evaluation by graduates *eg* how well-prepared are they?
- evaluation by employers of graduates
- other.

Where available, provide a copy of the School teaching portfolio.
Describe how the School plans to change how it monitors and evaluates the quality of its program.

A 2-page response is suggested.
APPENDIX 5: Australian Nursing & Midwifery Council – Standards – Monitoring & Evaluation

The Australian Nursing & Midwifery Accreditation Council’s Standards & Criteria for the Accreditation of Nursing & Midwifery Courses Leading to Registration has the following standards for monitoring and evaluation.

**Ongoing monitoring**
2. Collaborative approaches to evaluation of student professional experience placements.
3. Evidence of collaborative curriculum development and monitoring committee.

**Outcome evaluation**
1. Course experience questionnaires.
2. Student destination surveys.
3. Post-placement evaluation of students’ experience of the professional experience environment for quality improvement purposes.

**Feedback & reporting**
1. Collation of results and reporting of evaluation strategies.

APPENDIX 6: Student Perceptions of Teaching (SPOT)

The Student Perceptions of Teaching survey, commonly referred to as SPOT is an evaluation instrument designed to provide feedback to teachers about their teaching. The questionnaire is structured to enable student feedback to be obtained on specific aspects of an individual's teaching. The survey has 12 standard items with two open ended comment questions. Three survey types are available; one primarily for teaching (lecturing) one for tutoring (including lab demonstrating) and one for team teaching, which provides an aggregated evaluation for all members of a teaching team.

Confidentiality

A SPOT survey is initiated at the request of the individual staff member for teaching in a particular unit. Confidential reports are provided only to the teacher making the request, unless the teacher provides specific permission otherwise. To maintain the students' confidence in the anonymity of the SPOT survey, CATL withholds hand written comments until after the release of results, to avoid students being identified on the basis of handwriting.

The 12 core items for the new SPOT questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Survey</th>
<th>Tutor Survey</th>
<th>Team Teaching Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher explains important concepts/ideas in ways that I can understand</td>
<td>The tutor explains important concepts/ideas in ways that I can understand</td>
<td>The teachers explains important concepts/ideas in ways that I can understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher stimulates my interest in the subject</td>
<td>The tutor stimulates my interest in the subject</td>
<td>The teachers stimulates my interest in the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am encouraged to participate in classroom and/or online activities</td>
<td>I am encouraged to participate in classroom and/or online activities</td>
<td>I am encouraged to participate in classroom and/or online activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates enthusiasm in teaching the unit</td>
<td>The tutor demonstrates enthusiasm in teaching the unit</td>
<td>The teachers demonstrates enthusiasm in teaching the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appropriate teaching techniques are used by the teacher to enhance my learning</td>
<td>Appropriate teaching techniques are used by the tutor to enhance my learning</td>
<td>Appropriate teaching techniques are used by the teachers to enhance my learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The teacher is well prepared</td>
<td>The tutor is well prepared</td>
<td>The teachers are well prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The teacher is helpful if I encounter difficulties with the lecture/unit</td>
<td>The tutor is helpful if I encounter difficulties with the lecture/unit</td>
<td>The teachers are helpful if I encounter difficulties with the lecture/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The teacher treats me with respect</td>
<td>The tutor treats me with respect</td>
<td>The teachers treats me with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The teacher is available for consultation (eg email, online, face-to-face or telephone)</td>
<td>The tutor is available for consultation (eg email, online, face-to-face or telephone)</td>
<td>The teachers are available for consultation (eg email, online, face-to-face or telephone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I receive constructive feedback that assists my learning</td>
<td>I receive constructive feedback that assists my learning</td>
<td>I receive constructive feedback that assists my learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I receive feedback in time to help me improve</td>
<td>I receive feedback in time to help me improve</td>
<td>I receive feedback in time to help me improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Overall, the teacher effectively supports my teaching</td>
<td>Overall, the tutor effectively supports my teaching</td>
<td>Overall, the teachers effectively supports my teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>