

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**EVALUATION
IN
TERTIARY EDUCATION:**

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF SGID
(SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTIONAL DIAGNOSIS),
AS AN EVALUATION TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE THE
QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL PROVISION**

Wendy Baker



*being a thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Educational Administration in Education
at
Massey University*

1995

379.154

Bake

To My Mother who got me started
To My Husband, Roger who kept me going
To My Sister, Linda who supported along-the-way.

ABSTRACT

Quality today plays an increasingly prominent role in higher education world-wide and educational institutions are keen to acquire knowledge and strategies to address quality issues.

This major focus on quality raises questions about how to evaluate quality to discover what are the quality issues in higher education and how to improve them. This thesis is an evaluation of an evaluation method called, Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID). The aim of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of SGID as an evaluation technique for improving the quality of educational provision. To achieve this aim SGID processes were carried out in an Institute of Technology involving eleven classes (204 students and eleven lecturers) across four faculties and covered degree, diploma and certificate courses.

By evaluating the data obtained from these SGID processes this thesis attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of SGID to contribute to the improvement of educational provision by identifying the quality issues as perceived by students and by evaluating the improvement in the quality of educational provision, defined here as, an increased level of change in the student perspectives on those areas identified by students as needing improvement.

Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation techniques were used in this study. Qualitative techniques were used to identify the quality issues as perceived by the students, and largely quantitative techniques were used to monitor whether change took place. Interviews were used to gather the perceptions of change by the lecturers to the issues identified by the students and to elicit comments as to how they perceived the SGID process.

The results revealed that when given the opportunity, students identify quality issues pertaining not only to classroom practice but significantly to departmental and institutional practices as well. This process highlighted the wide ranging concerns of the

students for their total learning milieu and revealed the restrictive nature of most traditional evaluation techniques. Student feedback also indicated that students do not see themselves as principally responsible for their learning but rather see responsibility lying with lecturers and departments.

Lecturer interview comments indicated that they found the SGID method to be a powerful method for identifying quality issues about the total student learning experience but caution that it not be over-used or used exclusively. It is concluded that the majority of course evaluation methods currently in use focus on instructional practice only and therefore fail to capture adequately student feedback on departmental and institutional performance. The need to develop autonomous and self-directed learners by helping students to take increased responsibility for their own learning is identified as a challenge for lecturers.

The results on change indicated that greater change took place for those issues under the control of the lecturers and students, with a decreasing amount of change for department issues and little change with institutional issues. This may be because such data is not usually the subject of evaluations so no feedback communication channels have been established. There may also be an element of inadequate time encompassed by this study to allow for change to take place at departmental and institutional level.

When open ended approaches like SGID are used the educational provider can understand and capture students' points of view without predetermining those views by prior selection of categories and/or questions. The results from this study are a reflection of reality as perceived by students and have the potential to assist both the spread of practices perceived as helpful to learning and improvement in those practices perceived as hindering learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to many people for their help and support in the many facets of this work. Although individual mention of all these people is not possible my grateful appreciation is extended to all of them. To the following people I would like to make special mention.

To my supervisor, John Codd, I am grateful. His interest in my project from its inception to completion and his discerning advice have been of great value and encouragement, and his critical reading of the drafts at very short notice was greatly appreciated.

I am most grateful for my association with Carol Cardno, Manager of the Education Management Centre at UNITEC. Her interest and thoughtful comments on many aspects of my professional development and this project have been of inestimable value.

For the many hours spent discussing, reading and producing meals I owe a great deal to my husband, Roger. Without his acting as another supervisor, his support, computer skills and attention this thesis would not have been possible.

The collaborative work conducted with Warren Shephard, my colleague in the UNITEC Development Centre, has been of enormous help and enjoyment. Together we introduced the SGID method to UNITEC, trained facilitators, conducted research and produced a report.

To my extended family - Mum and Dad who assisted in collating data and especially to Linda and Jo for their interest, encouragement and tolerance. Thank you all.

To the lecturers who volunteered their classes for SGID evaluations and their time for briefing, post evaluation feedback and researcher-led interviews, and to the students across a range of certificate, diploma and degree courses who consented to take part in this research, I would like to extend my thanks for without their commitment and cooperation this research could not have taken place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Figures	viii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	7
<i>Evaluation of the Quality of Educational Provision</i>	9
<i>Effectiveness of Student Evaluation in Bringing about Improvement in the Quality of Educational Provision</i>	24
Chapter 3 Research Procedures	42
1. <i>The SGID Process</i>	46
2. <i>Post-SGID Follow Up to the SGID Process</i>	48
3. <i>Researcher Conducted Interviews with Course Lecturers</i>	49
4. <i>Collection of Data and Analysis</i>	50
Chapter 4 Results	55
Section 1 <i>Identification of Quality Issues</i>	57
Section 2 <i>Change</i>	64
Section 3 <i>Not Applicables</i>	80
Section 4 <i>Student & Lecturer Agreement</i>	86
Section 5 <i>Lecturer Interview Data</i>	92
Chapter 5 Discussion	103
<i>Quality Issues in Educational provision</i>	104
<i>What Helps Learning? What Hinders Learning? Suggestions for Improvement</i>	109
<i>Change As a Response to Student Feedback</i>	113

	Page
<i>The 'Goodness of Quality' of the Research</i>	128
Chapter 6 Conclusion	142
References	153
Appendices	168
<i>Appendix A A Step-by-Step Procedure for the Evaluation Process - SGID</i>	169
<i>Appendix B Letters & Information Sent to Staff & Students at UNITEC</i>	171
<i>Appendix B-1 Letters to lecturers inviting them to participate in the research project.</i>	172
<i>Appendix B-2 Letter to SGID facilitators inviting them to participate in the research project.</i>	174
<i>Appendix B-3 Letter to students</i>	176
<i>Appendix B-4 Student consent forms</i>	177
<i>Appendix B-5 Briefing letter to lecturers about interview.</i>	178
<i>Appendix B-6 SGID interview questionnaire.</i>	179
<i>Appendix C Report of all data collected from post-SGID follow up.</i>	181
<i>Appendix D Report of all data collected from post-SGID follow up with majority not applicables deleted.</i>	211
<i>Appendix E Report of data collected from post-SGID follow up where statements were perceived by majority as not applicable.</i>	240
<i>Appendix F Report of data collected from post-SGID follow up after attrition.</i>	249
<i>Appendix G Interview Statements (Question F) & SGID Comments.</i>	268

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Title	Page
1	Groups, subgroups and sub-subgroups into which SGID statements were sorted.	51
2	Number of comments made in each of the four groups.	58
3	Number of comments in subgroups of the four groups.	59
4	Number of comments made for each question.	60
5	Number of comments made for each question in the four groups.	61
6	Number of comments made for each question in the subgroups of the four groups.	62
7	<i>Hindrances</i> and <i>suggestions</i> for improvement comments and change percentage of change in groups.	65
8	Lecturer comments.	66
9	Lecturer hindrances and suggestions for improvement comments and percentage change by Lecturer subgroups.	67
10	Department comments.	69
11	Department hindrances and suggestions for improvement comments and percentage change by Department subgroups.	70
12	Institution comments.	73
13	Institution hindrances and suggestions for improvement comments and percentage change by Institution subgroups.	74
14	Student comments.	77
15	Student hindrances and suggestions for improvement comments and percentage change by Student subgroups.	78
16	A break down by group and by <i>hindrance</i> and <i>suggestion</i> of those comments which were perceived by the majority of students as not applicable and by lecturers as not applicable .	80

Figure	Title	Page
17	Amount of agreement between lecturer and student perceptions of change .	86
18	Proportion of students supporting statements made in SGIDs.	130
19	Comparison of amount of change between the full set of data and that used in this section with not applicables removed.	134
20	Number of statements made in the SGIDs, the number made after attrition is taken into account, and the attrition rate.	135
21	Comparison of the amount of change between the set of data with not applicables removed and that after attrition is taken into account.	137

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the 1990's quality plays an increasingly prominent role in higher education world-wide. The economic recessions in Western democracies in the last decade have led to concern about the share of public expenditure received by higher education and has spurred questioning of the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education (Harvey, 1993a). Many other expectations of, and changes in, higher education are bringing with them an increasing emphasis on quality and accountability. External pressures such as changes in the profile of student in-take, the competitive client-focused ethos in higher education, the introduction of staff appraisal schemes, quality audits and assessment procedures, increased higher education and industry collaboration, and demands for more *enterprising* graduates (Elton & Partington, 1991) means quality is being used as a vehicle by which accountability can be achieved, that is, *quality* is being seen as both a means and an end.

These demands for accountability will not disappear and it is an educational challenge to use accountability processes to enhance quality. Where the central activity of an higher education institution is the education of students, and students are the *raison d'être*, continuing improvement of the education process from the perspective of students is a central concern for quality. Barnett (1992) states that any approach to quality in education should be driven by two principles: that the central activity of higher education is the education of individual students and the need for continuing improvement in the educational processes.

Due to this interest in quality, institutions are predisposed to acquire knowledge and strategies to address quality issues. Evaluation is part of this broader process and the subject of this thesis.

Evaluation may be used for many purposes in education and the literature on evaluation provides multiple perceptions of evaluation (Nevo, 1995). Evaluation is sometimes perceived as determination of good achievement (Tyler, 1950), as assessment of merit (Scriven, 1967) or as a process of providing for decision makers (Cronbach, 1963; Alkin, 1969; Stufflebeam et al, 1971; Cooley & Bickel, 1986); as a synonym for measurement

(Thorndike & Hagen, 1961) or as a kind of research (Suchman, 1967; Cooley & Bickel, 1986). It is sometimes used for improvement (Cronbach, 1963 & 1982; Stufflebeam, et al, 1971; Cronbach, et al, 1980), sometimes for accountability (Scriven, 1967), and sometimes for the exercise of authority (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975).

These different perspectives can be categorised according to the purpose of the evaluation, that is, whether it is summative or formative, a distinction put forward by Scriven in 1967. Formative evaluation refers to the relationship of the evaluation to the client and the context it is designed for, it is intended to support a process of improvement; whilst summative evaluation is intended for, or carried out by, those who need conclusions for any reason other than development (Scriven, 1991). Thus formative evaluation deals with functions such as planning, monitoring or innovation whilst summative evaluation deals with functions such as selection, accreditation and accountability.

This thesis is an evaluation of an evaluation method, where the basic aim is to get a better understanding of the nature and effectiveness of the evaluation method called Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID). The evaluation purpose of this research is largely summative, that is to assess the merit of the evaluation method SGID. This contrasts with the SGID evaluation process itself which is primarily for the formative purposes of improvement, although it can be used for the purpose of accountability as a secondary consideration. To assess the merits of SGID this study investigates the effectiveness of SGID in improving the quality of educational provision at a tertiary institution.

The context of this study is a large New Zealand Institute of Technology (UNITEC) which offers to students a wide range of selected vocational education programmes, including degrees. The student population, like any tertiary institution, is made up of full and part timers and comprise a mixture of ages. The organisational structure of the institution is hierarchical with five Directors, seven faculties (Applied Skills, Business, Architecture and Design, Technology, Health, Humanities and Puukenga), Education

Services (Student Services, Centre for Professional Development and Education Research, Human Resources and Library), and campus services such as the Bookshop, Cafeteria, Sport and Recreation Centre, Student Union and the Works Registry (responsible for the campus and internal environment).

SGID is a method of evaluation which allows students to comment on how they perceive their learning situation, in the widest sense, at an educational institution. The method elicits comments from small groups, usually of four or five students, and feedback from the groups is facilitated by an independent facilitator who co-ordinates the production of a document which represents whole class opinion. (See Appendix A for a flow chart showing the step-by-step method of the SGID process.)

The criteria for the evaluation are generated entirely by the students in response to the three questions: *What helps your learning? What hinders your learning? What suggestions do you have for improving your learning?* These questions are open-ended allowing the students to comment on whatever is relevant to their learning; no specific comments or issues are solicited by the facilitator. The data therefore is generated entirely by the students, is very broad in its compass and is representative of their perspective at the time.

SGID evaluations have been conducted at UNITEC since 1992 by staff from what was then called the Centre for Professional Development and Educational Research and also by departmental lecturers who have been trained in the use of this method. Lecturers across most teaching departments often request an SGID to be carried out as an alternative to other forms of student evaluation. Due to the increasing interest in, and the resource intensive nature of, the method it seemed timely that some form of investigative research be carried out. There exists an intuitive feeling that SGID is useful and likely to lead to improvement of educational provision but there is an urgent need for empirical evidence to demonstrate this.

The aim of this research is to investigate whether SGID is an effective evaluation technique for improving the quality of educational provision. Educational provision refers to the total student learning experience in an institution. In this study effectiveness and quality is defined from the students' perspective. The question that needs to be asked is, how is it decided if a particular technique is effective in improving the quality of educational provision? Two main questions form the framework to ascertain the effectiveness of SGID in improving the quality of educational provision. These are *does SGID provide information about the quality of educational provision?* and *does SGID contribute to the improvement of the quality of educational provision?* Both are addressed from the students perspective.

The first question then is *does SGID provide information about the quality of educational provision from the students' perspective?* We need to discover what the quality issues in educational provision are for students if we are to know what is helping and hindering their learning from their perspective. This enables us to address what is important to students by strengthening what is helping their learning and improving what is hindering their learning.

The second question of *does SGID contribute to the improvement of the quality of educational provision from the students' perspective?* addresses whether the educational providers of educational provision have responded to the issues which students state hindered their learning and whether they have taken note of the suggestions for improvement made by the students. The educational providers in this context include the lecturers, the department and faculty, the institutional service providers and the institution itself.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the SGID process in relation to the two questions the following research questions were explored:

- What is quality in higher education?

- What type of data do we need to collect from students to discover their quality issues of educational provision? and does the SGID generate the type of data required?
- Does SGID generate data that gives a full picture of the reality of the educational environment as students experience it?
- Is SGID a useful and reliable tool for obtaining feedback on total student experiences of learning?
- What are the various conditions and factors that must be met and borne in mind to make student feedback as effective as possible? How does SGID accommodate these conditions and factors to make it an effective evaluation technique to improve the quality of educational provision?
- What are the issues surrounding student feedback that need to be addressed if it is to be effective in bringing about improvement? How well does SGID address these issues and is it an effective evaluation technique?
- Does SGID contribute to improvement by bringing about change in those issues identified by students as hindering or needing improvement of the educational provision?

These questions were addressed by carrying out SGID's with eleven classes at UNITEC in 1994. The first question was addressed using a qualitative method and the second question, which is one of change, was addressed by using a quantitative method. Discussion of the relevant literature, the methods used and the results provides an evaluation of the effectiveness of the SGID technique in improving the quality of educational provision at a tertiary institution.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evaluation of the quality of educational provision has been the central focus of various stakeholders ever since formal learner-teacher relationships evolved. This is illustrated by the following passage from Doyle (1983, 3) on the history of instructional evaluation:

In Antioch in about 350A.D. any father who felt dissatisfied with the performance of the teacher in whose care he had placed his son had the privilege of examining the boy, or having him examined by competent authority, to determine whether the teacher might have been neglecting his duty. If the examination indicated that the teacher had indeed been neglectful, the father could enter a formal complaint against the teacher and have the case tried by a panel of teachers and laymen. Should the trial confirm the teacher's negligence, the father would be permitted to transfer his son - along with his patronage and fees - to another teacher. This evaluation would be an important matter to most teachers because those who did not hold government appointments derived the whole of their incomes from these fees, and even those who did not hold such appointments sometimes received fees over and above their salaries (Walden, 1909, pp326, 178).

This research concerns students' evaluation of the quality of educational provision in a tertiary institution. Although the motivation for using student evaluations is not solely to ensure continued student patronage as in the historical account above, it is undeniably a concern for higher education institutions worldwide in order to survive in a competitive education environment as we head towards the 21st Century.

The focus of this research is to investigate the improvement of the quality of educational provision by using a particular evaluation process to collect and use student feedback in such a way that it stimulates improvement in the quality of an institution's educational provision. To achieve this goal the research and consequently this literature review has two main parts.

The first part is based on the premise that "before it is possible to develop a methodology for assessing quality it is necessary to identify what quality is and what criteria are being used for assessment" (Harvey et al, 1992, 4). Therefore, a review of what the literature reveals about the evaluation of *Quality of Educational Provision* in higher education is presented first. This includes exploring the concept of quality, student involvement in

evaluation of quality and a critique of teacher focussed student evaluations which makes up most of the evaluation literature. The concept of evaluating the total student experience of educational provision for quality improvement is introduced and possible methodologies for evaluating this approach are discussed. Finally, the process under investigation, SGID, is described and a brief summary of the research already carried out to date on this method is included.

The second part of the research, and this review, concerns the *Effectiveness of Student Evaluations in Bringing About Improvement in the Quality of Educational Provision* and presents the conditions and factors for effective use of student evaluation feedback in bringing about improvement. The common issues of reliability, validity, stability and generalisability, and cost effectiveness that inevitably raise concerns about the use of student evaluations, and therefore influences their usage, are initially touched upon and then the more appropriate issues as put forward by Guba & Lincoln (1989) credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability are investigated.

Evaluation of the Quality of Educational Provision

In common with world wide trends New Zealand higher education institutions are paying increasing attention to quality. This is occurring both centrally and at the level of the education provider (O'Connor & Codling, 1994). Ultimately we want quality to lead to a system where it is not enough to see students pass courses or even graduate and get jobs, but quality which results in a society of successful and contributing citizens that define and create a better world (Kaufman & Zahn, 1993).

What is quality?

This major focus on quality raises questions about what is meant by quality in higher education. "Quality is difficult to define for it is to do with nuance, with detail, with the subtle and unique things that make a difference" (Patton, 1980, 74). Therefore, quality is a question of meaning: What do programmes mean to participants? What is the quality of their experience? Definition is further complicated by the number of different interest groups (students and staff, accreditors and assessors, employers and the government) who have a stake in education. Because of the difficulty in defining quality some commentators have opted out of trying (Moodie 1986; Dochy et al, 1990; Vroeijenstijn, 1991). The basis for this is that quality is a relative concept and different interest groups in higher education have different priorities making definition difficult. It is therefore not surprising that there is no consensus as to a definition of quality.

Nevertheless, Harvey & Green (1993) have made a bold move and have 'defined' quality in five broad ways in relation to higher education. Firstly, quality is linked to the idea of exceptionally high standards - quality is something special; secondly, quality is viewed in terms of consistency - that is no defects and getting things right the first time; thirdly, quality is seen as fitness for purpose, but in whose conception of purpose?; fourthly, quality is defined as value for money - a populist notion; fifthly quality is interpreted as transformative in that education is not a service *for* a customer but a process of transformation *of* the participants - a qualitative change in students (Harvey et al, 1992).

Although a consensus on quality in education is not forthcoming, the thoughts and beliefs as to the meaning of quality that are held by the different interest groups can be used as criteria when evaluating educational quality. The Quality in Higher Education (QHE) project carried out in Britain from 1991 to 1993, refers to this as a stakeholder approach to quality, where the perspectives of the stakeholders about quality in higher education are sought. This approach holds that the stakeholder perspective and the definition of quality are interrelated and therefore quality is not a unitary concept but is defined as a range of qualities (Harvey et al, 1992).

In higher education quality assurance systems need to be particularly concerned with the views of a major stakeholder in higher education - the views of the students. Asking students through evaluation to express their satisfaction with the education they receive could be conceived as *buying into* the current fashionable notion of customer service which is rampant in all service organisations. But seeking student feedback is more than fashionable, it is essential in any attempts to improve the quality of higher education. As Dr Wunsch of the University of Hawaii states, it is "difficult for a university or college to espouse quality without taking steps to ensure feedback from students is routinely done" (Wunsch, 1993, 4).

A Rationale for Student Evaluation of Quality

Providing for students to evaluate their learning is part of their rights as learners. It is especially important with adults, for student evaluation of their learning experiences is considered one of the most valuable assessment tools available (Marsh, 1984). Students address the most profound aspect of teaching - the learning milieu, that is, the network of cultural, social, institutional and psychological variables that interplay in the complexities of teaching and learning. For instance, there are numerous constraints (legal, administrative, occupational, architectural and financial) on the organisation in an institution; there are pervasive operating assumptions (held about subjects, curricula, teaching methods and student assessment) held by faculty; there are individual teacher characteristics (teaching style, experience, professional and private goals) and there are student perspectives and pre-occupations (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). Student comment on these diverse and complex aspects of the learning milieu is essential if serious evaluation of the quality of education is to take place.

Also, in the present climate with education costs to students soaring, students are interested in evaluating the educational provision of an institution, for they are increasingly seeking value for money. Dahllof (1991) states that increased student

interest is not just seen as value for money but also as value for time, since the time they spend at college or university amounts to a critical formative period of their lives.

The literature on student evaluation (Astin, 1982; Centra, 1982; Manatt, 1988; Seldon, 1989; Ramsden, 1991) states clearly that students are in a particularly good position to comment upon the programmes of which they were members, and hence to assist institutions in their endeavours to improve the quality of their educational provision. Students are better placed than supervisors, administrators or managers to identify what are quality issues with regard to educational provision because they are constantly and directly exposed to all aspects of such provision.

Students are astute judges of teaching for they see a great deal of it and they understand what is and what is not useful in helping them learn. "Research findings that tell us about good teaching accurately reflect with single accuracy what your students will say if you ask them" (Ramsden, 1990, 1). Recent evidence confirming the value of student perspectives in a variety of educational contexts can be found in Batten's (1994) research where in an analysis of the comments from Australian secondary schools on what made the teacher the best, showed remarkable similarity to the kinds of things found in textbooks on teaching. In the work summarised by John Biggs (1990) there is much theoretical and empirical work which shows indisputable connections have been established between student perspectives of teaching and their learning in upper secondary and higher education level in a range of subject areas. But this aspect of student evaluation is not dealt with in this research. Hill (1995) considers the fact that students are more acutely aware of problems, and also that they are aware more quickly than other evaluators, as the prime value in student evaluation.

Use of student evaluation as the basis for evaluating teachers in particular, is full of difficulties, not the least of which are teacher reservations about students' evaluations (Page, 1974). Evaluation *anxiety* is a reality for lecturers in higher education who usually have little or no professional preparation and are plunged into a fear-provoking situation by student evaluation. If lecturers think in terms of student evaluation being

absolute judgments on their worth as people then they need to recognise that the evaluation a student makes is in the light of his/her conscious and unconscious personal needs, fears, and hopes (Page, 1974). It must be remembered that student evaluations are one strand of the total evaluation process; other audiences such as teaching staff, industry and the institution's review team should be consulted in the interests of gaining a total perspective on any course. Scriven (1990) states that no one thing should be the basis for teacher evaluation - that every conclusion should be triangulated.

Another difficulty with student evaluation is that there is no shortage of criticisms of their use. David Nevo puts forward criticisms such as "Students may also be biased in their ratings; those who are receiving high grades may give the teacher high ratings even if they see the teaching as poor and those who are receiving low grades might rate the teachers performance as poor, even if they believe the teacher is doing a good job...[and]...some teachers also react to student ratings by lowering their demands with the hope of 'improving' the ratings they get from their students" (Nevo, 1995, 147). Attitudes and concerns such as these have meant that often the students' perspective on teaching and learning is neglected and underrated in educational research (Batten, 1994).

Overall, however, it seems that the advantages of involving students in the evaluation outweighs the disadvantages. Evidence from the Quality in Higher Education (QHE) project showed that the issues which were regarded as important for quality in higher education were largely consensual across all the stakeholder groups - this included students (Harvey et al, 1992; Harvey, 1993a). A similar research project in Canada showed a high level of agreement with regard to a similar set of core quality criteria (Nadeau, 1993).

Student feedback is not a panacea but, taken together with other data, can give useful information on the process of learning and is part of what Rowntree (1974, 45) has described as "a rational, problem solving approach to education, a way of thinking sceptically and systematically about learning and teaching". According to Barnett

(1992), continual feedback, principally from students, should be sought and become part of the course ethos as it can inform attempts to improve the quality of higher education

Evaluation of the Total Student Experience for Quality Improvement of Educational Provision

Monitoring and evaluation of education is a very important feature of educational administration and practice and there is now a large amount of research literature on student ratings of instruction in higher education and the part they play in the appraisal of academics' performance (Cohen, 1981; Marsh 1984; Cruse, 1987; Abrami et al, 1990). Even though there is a new emphasis on the use of questionnaires to generate performance data that can be used with a quality framework (Yorke, 1995) it still reflects the current practice of most evaluation processes in higher education by focussing to a greater extent on the individual lecturers and the teaching skills he or she demonstrates - it is a very lecturer-centred evaluation. Less frequent in the research literature in higher education are evaluations concerned with total student experience, which includes their experience of the whole institution.

Whilst it is acknowledged that aspects of teaching and the teacher are paramount and much research has been conducted about students' views of what a good teacher is and the relationship of student learning to the quality of teaching (Ramsden, 1990), it is the purpose of this research that the focus should be wider and methods that address the broader aspects of the learning milieu are needed. We should still collect feedback on teaching from students but if we are concerned with quality then we need to elicit feedback on all aspects of educational provision. Improving the quality of education is more than the improvement of the individual teacher. Instead we should operate at more than one level of the system, the most obvious being the department or faculty as well as the individual, but also at the institutional level. As Elton & Partington (1991, 1) state "in its broadest sense, excellence in teaching, as interpreted through student experiences of learning, depends not only on the activities of individual teachers, but also on matters that affect this experience at departmental and institutional levels".

This approach is supported by the major outcome of the empirical research on quality criteria conducted by the Quality in Higher Education (QHE) project, 1992, in Britain. This project was conducted between 1991 - 1993 and aimed to develop a methodology for assessing quality in higher education. It set out to establish what is quality in higher education and identify criteria which different stakeholder groups regarded as important in assessing quality in higher education. A stakeholder approach to quality was adopted with the various stakeholders - students and staff, accreditors and assessors, employers, government - to find out the views on quality held by each group. The researchers obtained qualitative views of the stakeholders using discussion groups, informal interviews, letters and structured questionnaires. They used the term *total student experience* as an ironic corruption of TQM to indicate the focus of attention necessary for quality improvement.

The project concluded that it is the total student experience of learning that underpins assessment of quality in higher education (Harvey, 1993c). There was overwhelming agreement that the total student experience of learning and student attainment lie at the heart of quality in higher education systems (QHE Update, May, 1993). The total student experience goes beyond what happens in the classroom, and indeed, the performance of individual teachers (Harvey, 1993d). What happens before the student enrolls and the institutional context in which the students learn (including issues such as institutional ethos, institution-based resources such as the library and the institution-based student services) all contribute to quality for some stakeholder groups (Harvey, 1993a).

This has been regarded as a somewhat controversial and subversive view as recently as 1992 (Harvey, 1993c), but the QHE results reveal the quality criteria identified as important by the stakeholder groups suggest that many different aspects of higher education need to be taken into account. According to a study by Chris Loveluck (Harvey, 1993e) at Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education, older students with more work experience tend to identify a wider range of quality criteria than

do younger less experienced students. The nature of the factors also varied: the younger group were strongly influenced by attitudes of and relationships with staff. The older group were particularly concerned about more tangible factors, such as location. This is an important finding especially when the present trend is for larger numbers of mature students to return to higher education. A trend which will continue and increase given the current prediction of the need to retrain several times in the span of one's career.

Possible Ways to Evaluate the Total Student Experience of Learning

Gustafsson (1988) and Dunkin & Barnes (1986) join this approach in their recommendation of a more holistic perspective on evaluation in education. Hendershott & Wright (1993, 154) state "We do not know all the right questions to ask", students focus on different questions to educators, for example, studio space more of an issue for students than anyone else. Hill (1995) states that the focus on different questions is one of the best arguments for student input on the definition of quality not just the assessment of it. Therefore, if we are concerned with quality we need to focus on the total student experience of learning and discover their issues not predetermined issues. This allows an opportunity for students to play an integral and educative role in their learning. Astin (1985) refers to this as a quality of life approach, where students are asked to assess the quality of classroom interaction, academic and career advice, relationships with faculty members, administration processes, student support services and the general social and intellectual atmosphere.

What is the best way to evaluate the quality of educational provision? Research suggests that there is no one best way but we need to be creative and select techniques which consult students and find out about their issues and their criteria. Patton (1980, 82) explains, "In order to capture participants on their own terms one must learn their categories for rendering explicable and coherent the flux of raw reality".

There are comprehensive compilations of literature on methods for collecting and interpreting evaluations on the quality of teaching (Darling-Hammond et al 1983;

Ramsden & Dodds, 1989). The three most commonly employed evaluation techniques in education according to Haller & Strike (1986) are student achievement, student ratings of instruction, and classroom observation. The research presented in this thesis is only concerned with student feedback but according to Rotem & Glasman (1979) most of the student feedback data is numerical from rating scales and he suggests that other feedback (open ended questions) may produce more impact. However, most traditional evaluation approaches only seek to measure different aspects of teaching and the teacher, which is a natural and logical approach when the focus of accountability and quality assurance procedures is on teachers.

A good quality assurance system requires exploration of a range of issues asking the question, What is the quality of their experience? Answers require detailed, in-depth and holistic descriptions that represent people in their own terms and that get close enough to the situation being studied to understand first-hand the nuance of quality (Patton, 1980). To achieve this there is an urgent need to develop a wider range of measures if broader views about the nature and purpose of education are to be given credence. Thus, an holistic approach to evaluation design based on interviews and open questions provides a gestalt view to capture the point of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories. An approach including both individual as well as group responses through a process of carefully structured discussion, rather than a simplistic quantitative one based on questions (Blunden, 1995). Qualitative methods strive to understand phenomena and situations as a whole, and are more student/learner centred so students are not just involved in the process but share some of the power in generating the criteria themselves. Such approaches benefit the learning process itself in encouraging students to think critically about the course and their involvement in it, and in providing a means for them to communicate their thoughts and frustrations.

One type of method which may contribute to this more holistic approach is when student evaluations are made in groups rather than individually. A group technique can be a more effective tool than questionnaires for acquiring evaluative feedback by being more

personal and providing more opportunity to pursue unanticipated threads of thoughts. Group methods can take advantage of the freedom of response and flexibility, and of having access to the ideas of several respondents at the same time. This is what Gibbs et al (1989) refer to as the *ideological multiplier*, that is, when the ideas of one respondent stimulates thought in another so that through mutual efforts and sharing the group achieves more than any individual could alone.

The main advantage of groups is the explicit use of group interaction to relatively spontaneously produce data and insights that would be less accessible without such interaction; data that goes well beyond the focus questions. Although transcribing and coding of group data takes considerable time, it is less costly and less time consuming than individual interviews and groups yield equally rich data (Morgan, 1988).

Even so, groups have drawbacks. Although discussion is a very effective way of determining people's opinions and perceptions it has been criticised for not being rigorous, representative and neutral and for being time consuming (Gibbs et al, 1989). Ironically, these weaknesses are an outgrowth of its two greatest strengths, namely, flexibility and openness, that is, less control over the direction of a group and less control over the data that is generated than other forms of data collection.

It is well known that group dynamic processes can influence the behaviour of individuals. There is the danger of one or more respondents dominating the session, as well as *group-think* and members being influenced by the group mood (Baron & Byrne, 1987; Turner et al, 1989; Bogue & Saunders, 1992). Research has confirmed the popular belief that groups tend to reach more conservative decisions than individuals (Lamm & Myers, 1978). If conservative is seen as a rating closer to the mid-range of the scale, then it might be expected that student evaluations would be more positive when made by individuals rather than groups. There is reason to believe that student perceptions of deficiencies in teaching may be more likely to be positive in individual rather than group ratings. Research on conformity to group norms (Baron & Byrne, 1987) indicates that

where the group expectations are generally positive, it may be difficult for a group member to express negative views (Begum & Ahmed, 1988).

However, such research can be contrasted with other research on the phenomenon of group polarisation which indicates that group discussion may lead to a more extreme position which may be more conservative or more radical; that is, the initial tendency of the group is exaggerated (Moscovici & Zavalloni, 1969; Myers & Lamm, 1976; Tjosvold & Field, 1982) and may be regarded as a source of bias in the validity of ratings. These disadvantages are certainly very real and must be weighed up against the strengths and value of group evaluation. A search of the evaluation literature revealed several types of group methods which are advocated by researchers and practitioners for evaluation by students because of the strengths of group methods. These are Nominal Group Technique, Directed Small Group Discussion, Interactive Process-Oriented Approach and Focus Groups.

The *Nominal Group Technique* advocated by Fulmer & Fulmer (1990), is a method which allows those involved in a particular situation to know what they think or want as individuals, largely through brain storming. So the opinions, desires, wishes or suggestions of the groups are shared and organised on the basis of such shared knowledge and decisions made through the process of clarification and voting. A strength of the method is the outside facilitator and the democratic principles of operation.

The *directed small group discussion* method was devised in 1982 at Laval University for the Programme Committee of the faculty of Medicine (Talbot, 1992). It is a formative evaluation of courses and draws on Delphi technique and nominal group process, but is more easily administered and produces higher user satisfaction. Its reliability has been confirmed in educational and industrial applications. The directed group discussion method can provide feedback in the form of “value judgement” (Scallon, 1988) or “opinions” (Bloom et al, 1971).

Dahllof (1991) advocates *the interactive process-centred approach* as an optimum means of quality control evaluation at the programme level. It avoids an excessively narrow focus on the specific course and the individual teacher as the main objects of the evaluation; he sees it as providing rapid feed-back to assist improvement strategies.

Hendershott & Wright (1993) advocate *focus groups* as a participant- focused course evaluation methodology because they wanted to go beyond the students' learning process to gain as much information as possible about students' perceptions and attitudes regarding their educational requirements. They assert that student focus groups reveal more significant information than using machine scoreable tests. In the past, concerns have been expressed about the reliability and validity of focus groups. A recent article in the Evaluation Review (Ward et al, 1991) concludes that many applied researchers now consider focus groups highly appropriate means of obtaining an in-depth look at motivations behind human behaviour.

Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) is another group process which combines most of the strengths that are referred to by Fulmer & Fulmer (1990), Dahllof (1991) and Hendershott & Wright (1993). Whilst it is acknowledged that the disadvantages of group processes are also present in the SGID process, the advantages of the method may outweigh these if the method is effective in contributing to improving the quality of educational provision, the investigation of which is the purpose of this present research.

Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID).

SGID is a technique capable of evaluating educational provision - lecturers, courses, programmes, departments and institutional services, which has as its focus the learning experience of the students.

The SGID process was adapted from Melnick and Allen's clinical model developed at the University of Massachusetts (Bergquist & Phillipps, 1977) and was pioneered at the University of Washington by Dr Joseph Clark (Clark & Bekey, 1979). Dissemination of the

Method was underwritten during 1979-81 by FIPSE (Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) and the technique was demonstrated in over one hundred and thirty colleges and Universities. (Clark & Redmond, 1981) Since that time more than twenty institutions have established formal structures for providing SGID's (Wulff et al, 1985). The technique has been in existence since 1981, but little research has been carried out on it and what has been done is mainly in the United States (Clark & Redmond, 1981; Redmond, 1982; Bennett, 1987; Newby et al, 1991).

SGID is a method of evaluation which allows students to comment on how they perceive their learning situation. Although primarily designed with the purpose of improving instruction SGID can also provide information about student perceptions of their learning situation in the widest sense at an educational institution. The method elicits comments from small groups, usually four or five students, and feedback from the group is facilitated by an independent facilitator. The aim is for a final class consensus of opinion but the process used also accommodates any individual views that may differ from those of the majority. The criteria for the evaluation are entirely generated by students in response to three questions: *What helps your learning? What hinders your learning? What suggestions do you have for improvement?*

The open-endedness of SGID is responsible for generating holistic data on issues that students consider impact on their learning - their quality issues. It covers a wide range of issues not only on lecturer performance but on a whole range of learning factors - the quality of instruction, the quality of facilities and services and the quality of the educational environment and therefore provides a 'big' picture concerning the quality of their total educational provision from the students' perspective.

SGID is a qualitative research method in its own right and can be used to evaluate a subject or a course taken by one lecturer or a team of lecturers. It is a formative method in the sense that it is designed to improve the quality of technique and learning and not directly to assist with summative decision making concerning lecturer tenure. It is also a

formative process in that it is designed to be conducted mid-semester or mid-course so that confirmation, changes or modifications can be made.

SGID was originally designed for improving lecturer performance. At UNITEC the approach has been adapted the method in two ways (Baker & Shephard, unpub): opened up the focus to allow students to comment on all aspects of their learning experience in an institution in an attempt to discover their quality issues and more time has been allocated for collation of data **with** the students during the consensus seeking stage of the classroom evaluation session. SGID has three particular strengths as an evaluation process to improve quality: it is student centred; it is a process and it uses groups.

Firstly, the information is generated by students and has a broad focus giving equal emphasis to all aspects of their learning experiences as has already been discussed.

The second strength is that the SGID process is just that, a complete *process*, and not just a methodology for collecting information from students. This includes a briefing before the classroom data collection to gain commitment from the lecturer that the results will be taken seriously and acted upon wherever possible. Also, there are two feedback loops. One where the facilitator presents the data to the lecturer and together they undertake a data analysis and synthesis process. Research indicates that this is the part of the feedback process that leads to effectiveness and real improvement in quality (Aleamoni, 1974; Erickson & Erickson, 1979; Overall & Marsh, 1979; McKeachie et al, 1980; Aleamoni & Stevens, 1983; Menges, 1984). The second feedback loop is when the lecturer feeds back to the students, thanking them for their contributions and stating how they intend to respond to the data. This increases student satisfaction and shows confidence and interest in students' perceptions.

The third strength of SGID is that it is a group process so advantage can be taken of having access to the ideas of several people at the same time, and the ideological multiplier which is offered when the ideas of one person stimulate thought in another (Gibbs et al, 1989). Therefore insights are gained which would otherwise be less

accessible and perhaps invisible to the institution. The high level of involvement allows students to go beyond the focus questions because of the interaction and provides opportunities to pursue unanticipated threads of thought. Also it is more personal than questionnaires.

In the SGID process the students are treated as full partners in both the definition and evaluation of quality and therefore it is a strategy which benefits the learning process itself. It encourages students to think critically about their course and their involvement in them and in providing a means for them to communicate their thoughts and frustration's. SGID captures students' points of view without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of categories. A method that monitors quality in this way can be referred to as a bottom-up improvement orientated process (Yorke, 1995).

A survey of the literature reveals most of the research which has already been conducted on SGID has been in the USA. Purdue University in Indiana has used SGID in forty-six departments and has carried out 147 SGID's in one year. Here it was regarded as successful and used to determine the elements of University teaching that were of greatest concern to students and to determine the feasibility of comparing sub groups by instructor gender, class size and school discipline (Newby et al, 1991). The Seattle Community College District used SGID to help instructors assess their effectiveness and improve their performance in class. As a result faculty members have changed their instructional procedures, sometimes dramatically and with the number of changes increasing as instructors grow more experienced with SGID (Bennett 1988). The University of Washington carried out a study comparing student motivation of SGID participants and a control group and showed significant improvement in contributions by the SGID participants (Redmond, 1982). Here, Clark & Redmond (1981) also carried out more than forty SGID's in 1984, and conducted studies to reveal student perceptions and satisfaction with this and other evaluation methods. They concluded that students liked the SGID process and instructor satisfaction was high.

The Centre for Instruction Development and Research at the University of Washington (CIDR) currently continues to carry out increasing numbers of SGIDs for faculty members and report that students prefer the SGID method over end-of-course ratings because of the timing, feedback quality, oral exchange and personal approach involved (Nyquist, 1992).

In New Zealand the research on SGID that has been discovered is all unpublished material. It consists of work by Marjorie Manthei, Tony Smith and Wendy Baker & Warren Shephard. Under the guidance of Marjorie Manthei, Head of Staff Education Services at Christchurch Polytechnic one hundred and sixteen SGID's have been conducted between 1988 and 1991 involving 1,392 students and eighty tutors from eight departments. Manthei (unpub) used SGID to reveal what students think helps and hinders their learning, what students perceive differentiates the most and least effective classes, and also comments on how effective this method is for staff development. In 1992, Tony Smith, Head of Computer Studies at UNITEC, carried out a small research project using the SGID technique electronically in an effort to explore such use as an alternative to *face-to face* SGID. Face to face out-rated the electronic version for both students and staff (Smith et al, unpub).

Effectiveness of Student Evaluation in Bringing about Improvement in the Quality of Educational Provision.

Student evaluations can give feedback from their perspective on any number of aspects of the total learning milieu; the focus and breath of the feedback is entirely dependent on the evaluation technique used. Talbot (1992, 347) defines feedback as "the procedure of giving back information for the purposes of bringing change in the behaviour of those receiving the information and sits at the heart of any evaluation effort". However, student feedback does not automatically mean change takes place. Bringing about change in the behaviour of those receiving the information means improvement in the performance of those persons. Improvement is a complex and multifaceted concept yet it is often assumed that it is a simple process that magically follows when a person has discovered what ought to be done.

To ask if an evaluation techniques improves educational provision is to pose a misleading question, for it implies passivity on the part of those responsible (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988). Improvement will only result to the extent that those responsible are ready, willing and able to change in response to the evaluation. Effectively changing the behaviour the behaviour of a person or institution requires enlisting their cooperation and motivation, in addition to providing guidance on the issues which need improvement. The question then is how effective is student feedback in bringing about improvement? This poses yet another question - what is the meaning of *effective*? Effectiveness is the extent to which an evaluation accomplishes what it intended to accomplish (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988), so effectiveness of an evaluation technique must be measured in terms of the *purpose* of the evaluation. Here the purpose of student evaluations in the form of feedback is bringing about improvement and improvement in this study is defined as an increased level of change in the students' perceptions on those areas identified by students as needing improvement. So what helps lecturers, department and institutions respond to student evaluations?

In assessing the effectiveness of any student evaluation system what needs to be considered is its ability to contribute credible, dependable and confirmable information for improvement and its ability to be transferable and cost effective. These are issues that cause concern and influence the attitudes of the respondents of the information towards the data and are addressed later in this literature review. Also, the success of student feedback in bringing about change in the form of improvement depends on the feedback mechanism - the way the feedback is used and supplemented and the attitudes of the respondents. Various conditions and factors must be met and borne in mind if the feedback is to be as effective as possible. What the literature reveals on these conditions and factors will be described next. Before reviewing the relevant literature however, it is necessary to declare two assumptions upon which this collections of literature is based.

Firstly, the literature on effectiveness of student feedback usually deals with student evaluation ratings, not qualitative data and the evidence of improvement is in the form of

increased student ratings. The first assumption here is that despite the use of student ratings as a measure of improvement the same levels of effectiveness would apply to qualitative student feedback data. This assumption is based on the evidence of cross validation studies where the accuracy of data obtained from student ratings is validated by comparison with different methods of obtaining student opinions. Ory et al (1980) looked at three methods of obtaining data from students to determine the degree of congruence between the selected methods. They collected standard objective questionnaire items, written student comments to open-ended questions and conducted group interviews. There were fourteen class sections in four different subjects at three levels at college. The correlations across the three data sources were all significant and the degree of significance ranged from 0.81 to 0.94. In a similar later study Tiberius et al (1987) compared the information received from a student evaluation questionnaire with the results of a discussion with the same class. They found no difference in what the feedback actually covered but noted that teachers preferred the feedback from the discussion method because of the *depth* of the information they received. From these two studies there is very strong support for the conclusions that the information from student ratings accurately represents the way that students feel about their teacher and their teaching, and also that the conditions and factors that influence the effectiveness in one method are also likely to be those that have the same bearing on another method.

Secondly, most of the studies in the literature as to whether student feedback brings about change focuses on the teacher and teaching and there appears to be a dearth of studies in the literature about student feedback and change in institutional behaviour. Perhaps this is because this information is not generally sought. So the second assumption is that, those issues and conditions that will aid the lecturer to change are also effective criteria for departments and institutions to change. This assumption is based on our understanding about how organisations improve and assumes that the same conditions are effective for feedback to bring about change in institutions as they are with individuals.

Conditions and Factors for Effective Feedback

The literature reveals that attempts to use evaluation results alone as a means of feedback for improving teaching have met with varying degrees of success. Miller's study (1971) investigated teaching assistants and found no significant difference between student ratings in a pre-test and post-test design after the teachers had received feedback from the ratings. There are others that agree with Miller's findings (Gage et al, 1963; Pambookian, 1972; Centra 1973; Carter, 1974; Smith, 1977; Ramsey, 1980; Siagan, 1983). In contrast to these findings there are studies which reveal that teachers do change as the result of student feedback. Braunstein et al (1973), reported highly significant change in the median response from students for an experimental group of college professors who had received feedback in the form of results compared with a control group who had not received the results of the initial evaluation. This research is supported by other studies (Gage et al, 1960; Bryan, 1963; Tuckman & Oliver, 1967; Braunstein et al, 1973; Smith, 1975; Tuckman & Yates, 1980). These contrasting studies reveal the inconclusive and inconsistent nature of conclusions about student feedback improving teaching where the feedback is used on its own.

However, in Bryan's (1963), Tuckman & Oliver's (1967) and Spencer & Flyr's (1992) studies another factor regarding student feedback and its effectiveness in improving teaching is shown - that is, the significance of the feedback source. These studies showed that of all the sources - peer, supervisor, administrator, students - it is the feedback from students which makes a difference. Bryan's (1963) study clearly shows that teachers react negatively to feedback from their supervisors, whereas feedback from students was accepted. Tuckman & Oliver (1967) demonstrated that student feedback *improved* teacher behaviour, but supervisor feedback produced no additional effects when combined with student feedback and that teachers receiving feedback from supervisors alone changed more in the opposite direction. In Spencer & Flyr's (1992) study, respondents were asked to indicate whether student, peer and administrator evaluation had led to changes in such areas as teaching strategies, classroom management and basic philosophy of education. The respondents were most likely to use student feedback as an impetus for change, but only in specific areas such as altering

handout materials, changing the number of assignments and changing the pacing of lectures. Peer and administrator feedback was credited with a low impetus for change.

From these studies it can be stated that feedback sources do have a significant effect on whether improvement takes place. This seems logical for if an individual is to recognise a problem or acknowledge a needed change, he/she must first perceive that feedback comes from a respected source. Even positive comments are meaningless and ill-received if the teacher perceives an evaluation as lacking substance expertise. Therefore, the source of feedback is an important feature of an effective feedback strategy.

To increase the chances of student evaluation bringing about change in teacher behaviour it appears that student feedback needs to be augmented by dialogue. Two approaches to supplement information have been tried - the teacher discussing the results with the class and involving a third party to facilitate with the teacher discussion, and consideration of the results (the consultation approach).

With regard to the first approach, Friedlander (1978) investigated whether a discussion between the teacher and the class after a first evaluation would improve the ratings that the students gave the teacher in a subsequent evaluation. In the subsequent evaluation students rated the teachers who had had a *meaningful discussion* with their class significantly higher than those who had had little or no discussion with their classes. Care should be taken in extrapolating from these results as the teachers who had meaningful discussion were self-selecting and the comparison groups were not randomly assigned. However, a study by Abbott et al (1990) also showed that students were more satisfied with methods that had an extended teacher response after the evaluation than with traditional approaches, although other factors such as mid-term timing and using an interview method may have also confounded these results. Paul Miles (1989), in presenting guidelines for giving and receiving student feedback, states that the most important of these guidelines is to share reactions with the students to the feedback. Doyle (1983) also recommends this approach to evaluation where during a constructive in-class discussion the instructor presents his/her summary of the data, asks for

clarification and elaboration and presents his own point of view and planning for the future. The diagnostic and even pedagogical value of this sort of dialogue may outweigh the loss of instructional time and the initial anxiety of the teacher that such dialogue entails. Students will continue to respond openly if the teacher is both open and responsive to suggestions and demonstrates to students the usefulness of the information they have provided and calls students' attention to programme changes made in response to their feedback. Augmenting information from student ratings by discussion with the class is part of the SGID technique under investigation in this research.

The second approach, that of face-to-face consultation involving a third party to supplement the information obtained from student feedback is used in the SGID method. In one of the first experiments involving consultation conferences, Aleamoni (1974) as the researcher, met with the teachers in an experimental group to discuss the data from a student evaluation. The control groups received all the data, but did not participate in the conferences. The results indicate that the experimental group significantly improved their student ratings on two out of five dimensions - Course Content and Instructor - and Aleamoni argues that his inability to randomly assign teachers to the experimental and control groups may account for the moderate results on the other scales. But he still feels able to state, "It appears, therefore that the combination of feedback and personal consultation on student evaluations of course and instructor provide a better framework for encouraging instructor to use such results for potential improvement when compared to feedback of results alone" (Aleamoni, 1974, 30).

Another study by Overall & Marsh (1979) found that feedback from mid-term student ratings, coupled with a frank discussion of their implications with an external consultant resulted in more favourable ratings at the end of the term ratings. Rotem & Glasman (1979) also show that supplying the results alone is not enough for significant improvement. When feedback is conveyed to the instructor in the form of appraisals by students, without follow-up and with no consultant assistance, it does little or nothing to improve the instructor's performance. Further support for the use of student ratings information together with consultation is provided by McKeachie et al (1980). When

their studies of the effect upon teaching of feedback from student ratings was compared with the effect produced when such feedback was supplemented by consultation from a more experienced teacher, consultation enhanced the positive effect of the feedback in terms of later student ratings.

The longevity of student feedback augmented by a third party is revealed in two studies. A study by Erickson & Erickson (1979), consisted of two studies in which one was conducted to overcome the confounding factors in the first study of student expectancy. This was achieved by using students in subsequent years to rate the same teachers who were involved in the first study; that is, they assessed whether the improvements that had been made would be apparent to subsequent students who were unaware of the previous purpose and the project. For eleven of the twenty teacher involved the differences between the two ratings were statistically significant. As the second study was conducted from one to four semesters after those of the first study, these results indicate that the improvements are durable and relatively long lived.

In a ten year follow-up on a group of teachers who had been involved in a prior study which used student rating feedback with expert consultation, Aleamoni & Stevens (1983) found that these teachers received higher ratings throughout that ten year period, and also used student ratings and instructional services more frequently during the follow-up period than did teachers who had not been involved. They concluded that the usefulness of student rating feedback is ensured only when integrated with a system of instructional support

The value of using a third party in the consultant approach has been well demonstrated by empirical evidence and the effects of these studies confirms that teachers who had undergone consultation improved their teaching skill and that these changes were relatively long lived. But what is the nature of this consultancy? Marsh (1984) says in dealing with feedback, the most robust thing is that consultation augments the effects of written summaries, but insufficient attention has been given to determine the kind of consultative feedback that is most effective. In relation to this matter Rotem & Glasman

(1979), Dahllof (1991) and McKeachie et al (1980) suggest that statistical information lacks meaning for the recipients so aid with the interpretation and analysis of data is necessary to lead to an understanding of the process. Pambookian (1972) asserts that assisting teachers to make better use of the feedback in the development of improved skills and identifying more suitable ways to behave in and out of the classroom is necessary. The literature also suggest ways of conducting the consultation session. For the consultant, Aitken (1994) suggests the third party should share the data, give time for the data to be considered, discuss the teacher's perceptions of the data first, then comment if necessary on the data in a non-evaluative way, discuss future goals to be worked on together, hand over the data and respect confidentiality. And for the teacher, Gold & Roth (1993) suggest when receiving feedback use clarifying statements, provide summarising statements' reflect on content and feeling, avoid statements that block communication.

The value of student feedback in bringing about change is also enhanced when the feedback contains suggestions for improvement or solutions suggested by the participants (Talbot, 1992; Braskamp, 1984). In his study Wilson (1986) used several approaches to evaluate instructors and their course. He found that in fifty-two percent of cases in which appraisals took the form of suggestions to the instructor, substantial and significant changes were noted in subsequent evaluations. This is supported by Gold & Roth (1993) in whose study the teachers gave the highest rating to information with suggestions, followed by information only, and then information with directives. This is consistent with the theory of information and control, which suggests that the more choice that individuals are given over their activities, the more productive and satisfied they are.

Another factor which appears to enhance the effectiveness of student feedback in bringing about change is timing, that is the particular point in a course when the student evaluation is conducted. The 1979 study by Overall & Marsh (1979) also showed feedback from student ratings collected at mid-term result in more favourable gains at end of term, better final exam scores, more favourable affective outcomes. Scriven

(1991) strongly supports this view. He states that giving the client data and leaving it to them to integrate it according to their own values without guidance and support undermines the essential nature of performance evaluations. To him it abrogates the professional responsibility of the evaluator at a time which is often the most crucial moment - the moment when the client needs help most.

The specificity of the data is yet another factor to be considered. McLaughlin & Pfeifer(1988), Braskamp (1984) and Cohen & Herr (1982) suggest that global ratings are not enough to enable teachers to diagnose their teaching weaknesses. Specificity of data enables the teacher to engage in assessment of evaluation and so encourages open, constructive confrontation and can defuse defensiveness. Generalities or theoretical abstractions have little meaning for teachers as assessment of their performance or as a guide for growth. The information has to be explicit.

To improve the degree of effectiveness of student evaluation in terms of bringing about change in the teacher as perceived in student feedback, is to have the teacher initiate or at least be involved in, the evaluation and it should not be conducted without their active involvement. When teachers are involved in both requesting evaluations and having a say in how and what should be evaluated, the greatest satisfaction with the outcome and therefore the greatest change/improvement, eventuates (Maier & Hoffman, 1964; Kulik, 1977; Braden, 1987). Evaluations may be conducted but not acted upon, therefore interaction with the potential user(s) is currently viewed as the critical element in eliciting the commitment usually associated with a high level of evaluation usage. Alkin (1991) describes this as engagement with the *preconceived decision maker* in order to better understand and refine their concerns.

Effectively changing the behaviour of another person requires enlisting the cooperation and motivation of that person, in addition to providing guidance on the steps needed for improvement to occur. Aleamoni (1974, 4) sums it up by stating, "The success or failure of such a venture rests solely with the instructor and his willingness to both gather and use the data provided to him[/her]".

McLaughlin & Pfeifer (1988) state that the literature on adult learning suggests that the necessary conditions for improvement are reflection, motivation and integration. Like most professions, teaching is poorly organised to promote reflection among its practitioners (Schon, 1983). Reflection is not easy because most of us reflect not so much on how to learn as how to alter out actions “in order to win and not lose, in order to remain in unilateral control, and in order to protect ourselves from feeling vulnerable” (Argyris, 1982, 60). Reflection is a necessary first step in professional growth and improvement, powerful force for self improvement. Evaluation provides not only opportunity for reflection but also for creating an arena in which to reassess priorities. Reflection in absence of action fosters little improvement. Implicit in action taking place is a willingness to change. By being motivated to identify specific areas for improvement and professional growth through reflection and problem solving of the evaluation results, action can take place. Evaluation needs to be a process that enhances well being and allows opportunity for constructive and continuous action (Kaufman & Zahn, 1993).

For evaluation to be effective, lecturers need to feel that student evaluations are part of an empowering relationship, that is where they have some power over issues such as the type of evaluation, the timing of the evaluation and in the use of the evaluation results. This only happens when authority and responsibility is turned over to the partners (Kaufman & Zahn, 1993) for it is context-strategies which provide guidance on the steps needed for improvement to occur, not systems (Darling-Hammond et al, 1983). It is essential to establish enabling conditions which engender trust and open communication and strategies and processes that nurture and strengthen the commitment to meaningful evaluation.

Up to now discussion has dealt with direct interaction between students and teachers in the teaching/learning process, without specific reference to the wider organisation. At the institutional level the overarching value of student feedback lies in its potential to encourage a continuous process of quality improvement. If it does not, then it is not

worth the time, effort and resources that go into it (QHE, Update, Nov 1993). Evaluation can be the stimulus for new learning at both individual and institutional levels.

Change in individual learning does not automatically result in organisational improvement. Evaluation seems to be managed more effectively at the micro level (that of the individual teacher or small team) than at the macro level (that of the whole school or college or the wider system) (Aspinwall et al, 1992). Individual evaluations can be conducted but if the wider organisation is not open to receiving the information then it remains localised and prevents the wider institution from benefiting fully. To improve teaching there is a need to operate at more than one level - individual, department, institutional (Ramsden, 1991; Aspinwall et al, 1992). The learning climate within an organisation will influence not only what is evaluated and how, but also how the findings are received and what is learned from the experience. There needs to be a climate of trust and support, face to face communication and commitment to the evaluation process, then student evaluations will generate information that identifies areas of institutional strengths and weakness and identify directions for new activities, training efforts and revision of existing policy.

The amount and kind of resistance to evaluation emerges more from the structural features and interpersonal relationships comprising the organisations' culture than from differences in the evaluation methodology (Bonoma, 1977). Demonstration of a willingness to learn from experience and to consider the views of others is part of the process of developing a learning culture. Most will be learned from an evaluation when those involved have a commitment to such learning (Aspinwall et al, 1992). Organisational reflection occurs when the outcomes of an individual's evaluation are interpreted in terms of the individual and in terms of the context in which the individual functions, this creates a self generating mechanism for organisational and individual learning. Evaluation thus becomes an integrating mechanism and coupled with resources for development, student feedback can result in substantial growth in overall organisational capacity for improvement.

The most critical feature of effective feedback involves the teachers perception of its intent (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988). The summative/formative dilemma in evaluation is a constant theme in the teacher evaluation literature. Some hold strong views that accountability and improvement have opposite and contradictory purposes (Darling-Hammond et al, 1983; Ramsden, 1991). They hold that accountability is addressed through appraisal, that is summative evaluation, whilst improvement in teaching and clarification of educational theory is achieved through formative evaluation methods. Others (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988), whilst recognising the different goals and means of achieving them, do not see them as contradictory. They hold that accountability and improvement not only are compatible objectives; they are necessary partners. Accountability objectives provide the 'nudge', and improvement objectives provide support for professional goals and gives authority to accountability goals.

The *Quality of Goodness* of Student Feedback

In any consideration of the effectiveness of student feedback are the concerns of credibility, dependability, confirmability and transferability. Traditionally, these issues have been considered under the headings validity, reliability, generalisability and objectivity (or stability). In the type of research presented in this study which involves a constructivist (or naturalistic) approach using an illuminative evaluation tool, there are different concerns than the standardised traditional concepts. Guba & Lincoln's (1989) *trustworthiness* criteria of credibility, dependability, confirmability and transferability, which they have developed as appropriate parallel criteria "embedded in the basic belief system of constructivism itself" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 233), encompass these concerns more appropriately.

Before defining and discussing each of these terms, and because most of the literature addresses the commonly used terms of validity, reliability and generalisability, the issues involved with these will be reviewed. This approach is justified in that, being parallel criteria, there are many pertinent issues for this study addressed in the literature, although by a different name and with a different emphasis.

Doyle (1983), in his book *Evaluating Teaching*, defines validity as meaning, reliability as dealing with precision and generalisability as representation. Some authors (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Guba & Lincoln, 1989) refer to validity as internal validity and generalisability as external validity. In the literature there also seems to be some blurring of boundaries and definitions as validity and reliability appear to be used interchangeably, but they are different.

Validity refers to the meaning or “substance of a measurement” (Nevo, 1995, 97) and deals with the extent to which an *instrument* measures what it purports to be measuring, whilst reliability is about consistency, that is, how consistent is an instrument “in measuring whatever it measures”? (Nevo, 1995, 97). The two are not mutually exclusive in that “to be valid, an instrument has to be consistent in its measures, but an instrument can be reliable without being valid” (Nevo, 1995,97).

Generalisability deals with such questions as: Whose opinion and observations does this information represent? How well does this sample of information portray the totality of this lecturers teaching? What conditions surrounding the evaluation need to be kept constant - standardised - for the evaluation to be fair? It is about the degree to which evaluation results can be generalised across time, items and people (Doyle, 1983). It is concerned with whether student evaluations and teacher evaluations, for instance, are consistent. It is concerned with whether evaluation results differ if carried out at a particular time in a course or at a particular time of the day, or, as Cook & Campbell (1979, 37) state, “the approximate validity with which we infer that the presumed causal relationship can be generalised to and across alternate measures of the cause and effect and across different types of persons, settings and times”.

Objectivity has traditionally been regarded as central to any study and to any scientific inquiry. Since the seventies the requirement for strict objectivity, in fact the possibility of objectivity (Morgan, 1983), has declined. But there is still held to be a requirement for

objectivity defined as neutrality, that is, a demonstration that a given inquiry or research study is free of bias, values and/or prejudice (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

In summary, “the foregoing criteria are perfectly reasonable and appropriate. This is the case because [validity, generalisability], reliability, and objectivity are grounded - that is, have their foundational assumptions rooted in - the ontological and epistemological framework of that paradigm (model, world-view) for inquiry. But the traditional criteria are unworkable for constructivist, response approaches on axiomatic grounds.” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 235-6).

As a result of this criticism, in 1986 Guba & Lincoln published a set of criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1986) which closely parallel these traditional concepts, but are more appropriate for the constructivist approach, and thus for this research. These are credibility, dependability, confirmability and transferability which will, each in turn, be briefly described below. These descriptions have been drawn from Guba & Lincoln's (1989) book *Fourth Generation Evaluation*.

Credibility parallels validity and focuses on establishing the match between the constructed realities of respondents or stakeholders and those realities as represented by the evaluator and attributed to various stakeholders. There are a number of techniques for verifying the probability of such matches or isomorphism. *Prolonged engagement* in which the researcher has substantial involvement in the culture at the centre of the inquiry in order to minimise misinformation and distortions and establish rapport and trust. *Persistent observation* which enables the researcher to identify those characteristics and elements which are central to the inquiry. *Peer debriefing* in which a disinterested peer enters into extended and extensive discussion with the investigator in order to elicit and facilitate an understanding of the investigators own position, values and role in the study, and test out working hypothesis and make propositional the tacit and implicit information the investigator has. *Negative case analysis* in which working hypotheses are revised in the light of hindsight and developed until all known cases are accounted for. This process is analogous to statistical tests for quantitative data.

Progressive subjectivity is the process by which tacit acceptance of the subjectivity of any investigator is acknowledged and compensated for, to the extent of attempting to ensure that the investigators subjectivity does not override the subjects subjectivity, by means of a rigorous debriefing process. *Member checks* is the process by which hypotheses, data, preliminary categories and interpretations are checked with members of the stakeholder groups who supplied the original data. This process is the most crucial technique for establishing credibility and should be carried out at all stages of the process either formally or informally.

Transferability is parallel to generalisability. It differs from generalisability in that the burden of proof for transferability is on the *receiver* rather than on the *inquirer*. That is, rather than attempting to assess or prove that certain conditions are the same or have no impact, and thus results are generalisable, the emphasis is on providing extensive and careful description of the time, place, context, and so on, of the data from which results are derived. The onus is then on other investigators to assess whether the hypotheses are transferable to their particular situation to the degree with which salient conditions overlap.

Dependability is parallel to reliability and is concerned with the stability of data over time. Whereas reliability is dependant on *fixed* methodologies so results can be reliably compared, dependability recognises the inherent evolutionary process present in any worthwhile investigation as the research design and methodology adapts to feedback from the study. What is central to dependability, therefore, is the documenting of the logic of the process so that external reviewers/readers of the research can explore and understand the process. This documenting is referred to as a reliability audit.

Confirmability is parallel to the conventional criterion of objectivity. With conventional objectivity the emphasis is on ensuring that the particular method used to collect the data is followed correctly and findings are divorced from the values, motives, biases or political persuasions of the investigator. In contrast, confirmability is concerned with assurances of the integrity of the data itself. It is concerned with assuring that the data,

interpretations and outcomes of the investigation are rooted in contexts and persons apart from the evaluator are not simply figments of the evaluator's imagination. This is done by carrying out a *confirmability audit* by which data can be tracked to their sources, and the logic used to arrive at interpretations and hypotheses are explicitly stated.

Guba & Lincoln (1989) also present another way of judging the quality of constructivist, illuminative evaluation processes, and that is by looking within the process itself. They call this an hermeneutic, dialectic process and argue that its self analytical approach leaves few "opportunities for error[s] to go undetected and/or unchallenged...It is the immediate and continuing interplay of information that militates against the possibility of non-credible outcomes." (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, 244). Being a dialectical (that is one of logical disputation to test the truth of opinions by discussion) process, all information is subject to continuous and multiple challenges from all the stakeholders and this publicly inspectable and inspected nature of the hermeneutic (interpretative) process itself prevents secrecy and "poverty of information".

Having discussed the criteria of *trustworthiness*, and the contribution of the hermeneutic process itself, Guba & Lincoln (1989, 233) have "invok[ed] a new set of non-foundational criteria - but criteria embedded in the basic belief system of constructivism itself - which we have termed the *authenticity* criteria." These criteria are ones of fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity and tactical authenticity. Fairness refers to the extent to which "different constructions and their underlying value structures are solicited and honored [sic] within the evaluation process" Guba & Lincoln (1989, 245-6), and include stakeholder identification and open negotiation of recommendations and agenda. Ontological authenticity refers to the extent to which the individual respondents' own understanding of their own *world* is enhanced, whilst educative authenticity represents the extent to which their understanding of others, outside of their own stakeholder group, is enhanced. The last two criterion deal with change and empowerment. Catalytic authenticity is about the extent to which action is stimulated and facilitated by the evaluation process, whilst

tactical authenticity addresses the degree to which stakeholders and participants are empowered to act, given the stimulus to act.

Another issue of concern to any evaluation method is its utility. Doyle (1983, 15) summarises utility as addressing “What purposes can this information legitimately and cost effectively serve?” The cost effectiveness of a particular evaluation method involves a number of issues, both at the macro and the micro level. The purpose of the evaluation needs to be clearly defined. Is it to satisfy a statutory requirement? is it to justify a particular level of funding? is it to provide feedback to a course coordinator as to suitability of content and structure? or is it to provide a lecturer with comments on his/her teaching style? Each of these reasons for carrying out an evaluation, whilst all are equally valid, will justify different levels of expenditure in carrying them out.

Expenditure on evaluations come in a variety of forms (Aspinwall et al, 1992). There are actual dollars as measured by, for example, materials and photocopying cost for questionnaires and the like, or salary and wage dollars for time spent preparing for, carrying out and analysing the evaluation. There are also costs associated with individuals spending their *own* time on various stages of the process. There is student time. This may mean a shortened course if the evaluation procedure is contained within the designated course hours, and thus students pay for it in their fees; or it may mean students encroaching on their own time to fill out evaluation forms or whatever. If an *evaluation consultant* is used, whether external or internal, expert or simply peer review, there will be a cost, either direct or indirect, involved.

These are only a random selection of the types of costs involved. What is clear from a search of the literature and personal experience, is that attempting to quantify this cost is a difficult exercise (Alkin & Solman, 1983; Worthen & Sanders, 1987). Worthen & Sanders (1987) place these various costs into four groups: cost benefit, cost utility, cost feasibility and cost effectiveness. Cost benefit attempts to analyse the various costs and benefits as measured in monetary terms and to produce a *balance sheet* to assess whether benefits outweigh the costs. Cost utility attempts the very subjective exercise of assessing the utility of a particular method. Cost feasibility is concerned with attempting

to assess the costs of an evaluation method prior to embarking on it. Cost effectiveness is concerned with comparing the costs of different evaluation methods and assessing which ones should be utilised as a result.

In spite of being difficult what is clear is that the exercise of attempting to assess costs must always be attempted, in an effort to at least gain an idea of the cost, if not the actual cost, so an informed judgement can be made as to the advisability of carrying out a particular form of evaluation. The corollary to this is that, when a new evaluation tool or technique is introduced, the cost of administering and analysing the technique must be evaluated, as well as its suitability, validity, etc for evaluating whatever it is suppose to be evaluating. It is no use using either a sledge hammer to crack a nut or a nail file to break rocks. These analogies refer to costs as well as techniques.

Apart from actual costs, whether direct or indirect, there are other issues which also come into the gambit of cost effectiveness. A number of these also impinge on credibility and dependability. Whatever the method, its usefulness must be sold to the participants (Aspinwall et al, 1992). That is, it is no use having a method which is cheap to administer, if those responding to the method, or those using the data collected, do not see the value of it.

The central thesis of this research is that the prime focus of student evaluation is improvement in the quality of educational provision which entails potentially changing the behaviour of a number of aspects relating to all institutional personnel, services and processes. Evaluation of educational provision which is directed towards the teaching/learning function itself as well as issues pertaining to the infrastructure of all aspects of the institution, is absolutely necessary to gain the much needed self-insight and rapid self-correction, by all the stakeholders with a view to improving the quality of educational provision in the total learning milieu of higher education institutions. Student evaluation provides a unique opportunity to contribute to this improvement but approaches, methods and processes must be employed which satisfy the conditions and issues which contribute to effectiveness.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This study is the evaluation of an evaluation process. The process being evaluated, SGID, can be described as an illuminative evaluation technique (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). It is a qualitative, subjective, formative process with a primary concern for description and interpretation rather than measurement and prediction (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972).

The reason for evaluating the method is to assess the perceived effectiveness of the SGID process as an evaluation technique. This raises a number of issues. What is meant by effectiveness? How does one *measure* the effectiveness of a subjective, qualitative method? The method is student based, from whose perspective should it be evaluated? How does one assess the reliability and validity of the study results? Are the results generalisable? Are the SGID evaluation *results* generalisable?

The issues surrounding what is meant by *effectiveness* have been discussed in the previous two sections. In this study, effectiveness relates to two key issues: does the method identify quality issues? and does change occur within the learning environment?

To answer the first of these questions and some aspects of the second, a case study approach has been used; that is, data was collected from a number of courses within the one tertiary educational institution in 1994. The data collected was the comments from the SGID's carried out and these comments are subjective, descriptive ones of the total learning milieu from the students perspective. The analysis of these comments and the subsequent grouping and sub-grouping of them to ascertain the quality issues identified by the students can only be done by subjective interpretation. So too are the conclusions drawn from such identification. This process is the nexus of an illuminative evaluation approach.

To address the second question, the assessment of change, a quantitative approach has been used. The vehicle for collecting this quantitative data has been a questionnaire in which students indicate whether change has taken place or not with respect to the

comments made in the SGID. As with all such questionnaires, whether they use a Likhart scale or a binary one as in this study, the quantitative data collected is subjective.

The study has used a naturalist evaluation approach, or as Guba & Lincoln (1989) now call it, a constructivist approach. It is participative and student centred at all stages. Even when lecturers are interviewed, it is with respect to the lecturers perceptions of the student identified issues. The issues themselves encompass the whole realm of the learning milieu as perceived by the students and are elicited by open, non-directed questions. The only external prompt to identifying the issues for the individual student is that provided by other students in the group process. The facilitators provide no element of leadership or direction other than what is required for the administrative aspects of the process; they act as neutral recorders of the data presented by the students themselves.

The actual procedures, methods and *sample* surveyed in this research are now presented.

Data was collected from two hundred and four students and eleven lecturers from eleven classes. The first part of this was a qualitative constructivist evaluation to identify the quality issues as perceived by the students. It was carried out in conjunction with an internal UNITEC Research Project by Wendy Baker and Warren Shepherd (unpub) which investigated the potential of the SGID method of evaluation in higher education and involved three hundred and sixty six students and eighteen lecturers from twenty classes. The second part of this study is a subjective quantitative evaluation to investigate the effectiveness of the SGID process as an evaluation tool by monitoring change as perceived by students. Triangulation with lecturers' perceptions was then used to enhance validity.

The eleven classes used for this study were drawn from four faculties and across all three programme types (degree, diploma and certificate).

There were four distinct stages in the study. These stages comprised firstly, the selection of classes to take part in the study and the carrying out of the SGID process. Being a

formative evaluation technique this took place about half way through the programme. Secondly, the follow up survey which was carried out towards the end of the course and surveyed the students and lecturers regarding their perceptions of the change which had taken place with regard to the issues identified in the SGID process. Thirdly, the lecturers were interviewed to ascertain their perceptions of the veracity and effectiveness of the SGID process. This stage plays only a small part in this research. Lastly, all the data collected was collated and analysed.

Each of these stages is described, in turn, below.

1. The SGID Process:

All participants in the study were *volunteers*. Initially, a letter was sent to full-time lecturers within UNITEC outlining the parameters of the project and inviting them to participate (Appendix B-1). At the same time, a letter was sent out to prospective facilitators who could carry out the SGID evaluations (Appendix B-2). These facilitators were targeted staff who had already undergone a full day's training in 1993. Eleven lecturers and four facilitators volunteered to participate in this research.

The researcher took responsibility for selecting facilitators for the SGID evaluations that were requested and generally coordinating the process. HoDs and programme coordinators were advised of their lecturer's involvement in the research project.

Being a formative evaluation tool, the SGID process was carried out in the middle of the programme. The process itself took forty five to seventy five minutes to carry out so the actual timetable arrangements were left to the course lecturer and the SGID facilitator to negotiate. The same was done for the post-evaluation feedback to the lecturer which took about forty minutes.

Facilitators were briefed, once they had volunteered their services, to fully inform them on the nature of the research and to review the SGID process to ensure *uniformity* of facilitation as much as possible. One issue which facilitators were alerted to in their pre-SGID briefings with lecturers was whether the SGID evaluation was for an individual lecturer or a teaching team as it was essential that consent was gained from all members. No teaching teams were involved in the eleven classes chosen for this study to avoid the possible confounding effects of having lecturers being commented on who were not directly involved in the SGID feedback. The facilitators were also requested to introduce themselves to the class the day before the SGID was to take place.

Immediately prior to the SGID evaluation taking place, a letter was distributed to the students in the class outlining the nature of the research project along with an approval

form, requesting their consent to the use of the data for the purposes of research (Appendices B-3 & B-4). Approval from students was forthcoming in about 98% of cases.

The SGID procedure involved students being divided into small groups of four or five to discuss and then record group consensus views in response to three questions:

- *What's helped your learning on this course?*
- *What's hindered your learning?*
- *What suggestions do you have for improving your learning?*

Facilitators were reminded that they should alert students to considering what impacted on their learning in the broadest possible sense and not to restrict or narrow the focus in any way.

Following each question, each group's findings recorded on newsprint were displayed for general viewing and discussion and from these a master list of findings was compiled which represented a class consensus view.

The master list of raw student data was taken away by the SGID facilitator and typed up. Once the typed-up transcript was ready, the raw student data was then destroyed. The data generated from the SGID evaluations represented student perceptions about the quality issues underpinning current educational provision at UNITEC.

The last step in this phase was the post-evaluation feedback in which the facilitator presented the typed-up transcript to the course lecturer/s, and discussed the findings in terms of the issues that had emerged and the attendant changes that could be made. The lecturer then went back to his class and carried out a post-evaluation feedback session with the students in which clarification and confirmation of the issues was carried out, and where appropriate, or possible, issues were addressed by the lecturer. This session averaged approximately fifteen minutes.

2. Post-SGID Follow Up to the SGID Process:

This phase of the study was carried out in order to monitor the change resulting from the SGID and hence assess the effectiveness of the process.

The typed up transcript of the SGID raw data was adapted to form a questionnaire on which students could individually assess each statement made as to **change** or **no change**. Only *hindrance to learning* and *suggestions for improving learning* statements were included in the questionnaire. It was deemed inappropriate to monitor change with respect to the statements identifying items which had *helped learning*. It may have been interesting to evaluate such change, but it was decided to leave it out because it would have been measuring a different type of change, i.e. has the helpfulness continued, improved or regressed. If the *behaviour* had simply continued, no change would have taken place giving a spurious result in terms of the change being measured in this research.

“Change” denotes whether the issue incorporated in the statement has been addressed or not and includes “satisfactory explanation” of the issue whether actual change has taken place or not. A third category, **not applicable**, is included. This category allows a response from students who did not originally support the statement as well as responses for issues that no longer exist, or no longer are of concern, since the SGID was carried out. Such an issue may be one which commented on heat and sun which was no longer a problem when the follow up took place in late autumn; or a comment on orientation which only relates to the start of the course.

Lecturers were also given the same follow up questionnaire so their perceptions of change with respect to the student identified issues could be elicited.

The post-SGID follow up was carried out at the end of the course and thus sought to identify whether change which had taken place since the SGID process was carried out. Those students who had been absent from the SGID did not take part in the follow up

(discussed further in section 4 of this chapter). Anonymity was retained throughout the study so measures of change could only be ascertained by class location. Individual consistency with respect to the **not applicable** response from SGID to follow up could not be tracked. Thus, the following question could not be answered: did students who disagreed with the inclusion of the original statement in the SGID mark the follow up as not applicable or did they comment on change?

3. Researcher-conducted interviews with course lecturers

Interviews were conducted with Lecturers to establish their perceptions of the SGID process.

The focus was on the lecturer's assessment of the overall effectiveness of the SGID method as an evaluation instrument capable of generating quality feedback, and specifically their perceptions of student suggestions, and what changes they perceived had taken place. The method used was that of direct face-to-face interview. This was also carried out as part of the UNITEC Project and both researchers were in attendance - one conducting the oral interview, the other recording the lecturer's responses. Each interview took at least forty five minutes to complete.

Prior to the interview taking place, the course lecturers were sent a structured questionnaire containing the questions to be discussed during the interview (Appendices B-5 & B-6). Lecturers were thus able to prepare responses before hand and use them as prompts in their answers.

4. Collation of Data and Analysis:

Once the typed transcript from an SGID was received from the facilitator, the responses were assigned initially into four groups according to where principal responsibility for the issue was seen to lie. The four groups were defined according to whether the responses pertained to (1) the lecturer, (2) the Department, (3) the Institution or (4) the Students themselves. These groups were further subdivided as shown in figure 1 and these sub-groups indicate the issues commented upon by the students. For some parts of this thesis some of the sub-groupings were further subdivided into sub-subgroups as illustrated in figure 1. Although subjective, the majority of statements fell logically into these groupings and sub-groupings, some difficulty was encountered assigning a few of the statements. Examples of these were comments such as *large class sizes* which could be assigned to Department or Institution, and *too much content to get through* which could be the responsibility of the Lecturer or the Department. In other instances there was difficulty in assigning the comment to the appropriate sub-grouping. An example of this was *longer time in the Learning Centre* which was an organisational issue but could be assigned to timetabling, curriculum content or facilities. Thus, the subjective nature of the grouping of the issues can be seen, but assignment to groups was carried out in a consistent and informed way.

Thus, groupings allowed subjective qualitative analysis of the statements and identification of the quality issues identified by the process. Common issues across the three questions of *helped*, *hindered* and *suggestions* were also analysed.

The data collected from the post-SGID follow up questionnaire was entered into a *Microsoft Access*® database. The information entered included identification of the class, the number of students who took part in the SGID and in the post-SGID follow up, and the statement made. For each statement the number of responses was recorded for each of the categories **change**, **no change** and **not applicable**. The Lecturers response was also entered.

Figure 1: Groups, subgroups and sub-sub-groupings into which SGID comments were sorted.

Group	Subgroup	Sub-Subgroup
Responses pertaining to: Lecturer	Personal Qualities	
	Professional Practice	Teaching Methods Communication Classroom Organisation Lecturer Availability Resource Management Workload
Responses pertaining to: Department	Content	
	Organisation	Timetabling Length of Classes Communication Organisation of Delivery Assignments Costs
	Assessment	
	Materials	
	Facilities & Services	
Responses pertaining to: Institution	Services	Cafeteria Library & Reading Room Bookshop Entertainment/Fitness Facilities General
	Environment	Internal Classroom Environment External Campus Environment
Responses pertaining to: Students	Class Dynamics	Undesirable Behaviour Participation
	Outside Factors	Finances
	Personal Factors	Personal Qualities Personal Expectations

Percentages were calculated for **change**, **no change** and **not applicable** for each of the statements. Percentages were also calculated by subgroup, group, *hindrance* and *suggestion*, and across all the data. Percentages were the only form of statistical analysis carried out on the data, as being qualitative research, other statistical analyses or attempts at tests of significance were inappropriate.

A number of issues or possible confounding effects are present in the data. These include the effect of:

- **not applicables** on the measure of change,
- the attrition rate, i.e. the effect of fewer students taking part in the post-SGID follow up than in the SGID itself,
- the degree of support for statements made in the SGID given that some statements were not supported unanimously,

Each of these is now discussed.

The **not applicable** responses introduce two issues. Firstly, what effect does it have on the assessment of change when a statement is deemed **not applicable** by the majority of students? Secondly, even when the majority of students record **change** or **no change**, what confounding effect do statements which are not applicable have in these cases?

For the purposes of this study it was decided that where the number of students who perceived a statement to be not applicable is greater than or equal to those who commented on change, that statement would be dropped out of the analysis of change. This data is presented in Appendix D. Those statements dropped from the analysis are included in the full set of data in Appendix C, and are separately listed in the table in Appendix E.

The focus of the post-SGID follow up is to monitor whether change has taken place or not as a result of the SGID process. The data from this part of the study, therefore, is presented showing, **change**, **no change** and **not applicable**, and then the **not applicable**'s are dropped out in the next two columns of the report and the total number of responses dealing with **change** and **no change** calculated. By removing the confounding effect of **not applicable** a clearer indication of change, or lack of it, is produced. Removal of this category is the equivalent to removing noise in terms of physics. Such manipulation of the data focuses attention on the **change/no change** dichotomy and highlights the degree of change relative to no change. As this part of the study is only concerned with monitoring change, or lack of it, as a result of feedback from the SGID evaluation process; the reasons why students do not find a particular statement applicable to them are irrelevant, and can be validly removed from the present analysis.

For the post-SGID follow up only those students who took part in the original SGID were used. This was to ensure that no confounding effects were introduced into the assessment of change by people commenting on statements for which they were not responsible. In some cases, some individuals who took part in the SGID were absent from the follow up session. The effects of this were evaluated by removing all those classes from the analysis which had fewer students taking part in the follow up and comparing the amount of change present with the full data. This gave some measure of the robusticity of the results and grounds for including all the classes in the study whether or not all students took part. It should be remembered that as whole classes are being removed, the degree of change being compared here is assuming that the trends for change are consistent across all classes.

As a part of the SGID process, and to ensure that all views on each statement were heard, the SGID facilitator confirmed that all participants agreed with each statement made. Where necessary the statement was amended, or if agreement was not unanimous, the number of dissenters was recorded. The amount of *support* for the statements made in the SGID process was measured by the ratio of the number of people

supporting each statement relative to the total possible number supporting each statement. This measure of support was derived for the four groups, Lecturer, Department, Institution and Students, and across all statements pertaining to *what hindered learning* and *suggestions for improving learning*.

Lecturer evaluations of change as recorded on the post-SGID follow up questionnaire are presented with the student data. Interview data is handled separately and primarily to:

- assess the degree of consistency between the interview and questionnaire by the lecturer,
- aid in assessing the consistency in perceptions of change by students and lecturers,
- provide information to aid analysis and discussion of the results obtained from the students.

This chapter has set out the procedures, method and sample used in this evaluation study. The student centred SGID process has been detailed, the qualitative and quantitative techniques used to evaluate the processes, both for identifying the quality issues and monitoring change resulting from the SGID process, have been defined along with description of the lecturer interview process. The manner in which the data is collated, analysed and presented in the following results section has been set out in some detail.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of this research are presented in five sections. Section One identifies what students comment on when given an open ended approach involving the three questions: what helped their learning? what hindered their learning? and what suggestion do they have for improving their learning?. The quality issues as perceived by the students are grouped into these three categories. Section Two presents the results of the post-SGID follow up which monitors the change that has occurred in relation to the issues identified by the SGID process. Sections Three and Four both focus on aspects of change. Section Three focuses on the statements which have been deleted from the results presented in Section Two because the majority of students perceived that they were unable to comment on the applicability of the statements. Section Four looks at the agreement between the perceptions of students and lecturers as stated by the lecturers responding to the post-SGID follow up questionnaire. Section Five presents the data collected from the lecturer interviews.

Section One: IDENTIFICATION OF QUALITY ISSUES

This section identifies those areas which students commented upon, i.e. the quality issues identified by the students', and also reveals the students' groupings of the issues into the three categories of what helped their learning, what hindered their learning, their suggestions for improvement.

The total number of comments recorded from the SGID processes from eleven classes involving two hundred and four students was four hundred and twenty one.

Description of Groupings

These comments were initially assigned to four groups the basis of which has been described in the Research Procedures chapter. The four groups are:

Lecturers
Department
Institution
Students

These four groups were further subdivided into subgroups of quality issues. The subgroups indicated the issues commented upon by students in each group. For example the Lecturer group was subdivided into Personal Qualities such as *approachable, friendly* and Professional Qualities such as *not finishing on time, good explanation of terminology*. The Department group has the largest number of subgroups with five, while the Student group has three and Lecturer and institution both have only two subgroups (see figure 1 in the Research Procedures chapter).

The results of these groupings are presented in two parts:

Part A The number of comments each group and subgroup attracted. These groupings indicate the quality issues for students.

Part B The groupings are categorised according to the three questions *What helped your learning? What hindered your learning* and *Suggestions for Improvement*. These categories indicate which of the quality issues

students perceive as helping their learning, hindering their learning and those comments which were suggestions for improvement.

Part A The number of comments each group and subgroup attracted

It can be seen from Figure 2 that the majority of comments pertain to Lecturer and Department with approximately one third of comments each, whilst less than one tenth of the comments were about Students themselves.

Figure 2: Number of Comments Made in Each of the Four Groups

Group	Actual Comments	% of all Comments
Lecturer	148	35%
Department	137	33%
Institution	97	23%
Students	39	9%

What is of particular interest with these results is that approximately one third of the comments deal with issues not usually the subject of evaluations. These comments related to the Institution (library, cafeteria, noise, air conditioning, signage) and Students themselves (relating to each other, having to earn money to pay fees, personal motivation). The Departmental issues (amount of content, timetabling, pre-course information) and lecturer issues (variety and range of teaching methods, support and advice, subject expertise) were those more usually dealt with by student evaluations..

Figure 3 shows the number of comments each subgroup attracted. The Lecturers group Professional Practice attracted over seven times as many comments as for their Personal Qualities. From these results it would appear that students' quality issues are not concerned directly with lecturer personality.

Figure 3: Number of Comments in Subgroups of the Four Groups

Group	Subgroup	Actual Comment	% of Group Comments
Lecturer	Personal Qualities	18	12%
	Professional Practice	130	88%
Department	Content	17	12%
	Organisation	61	45%
	Assessment	8	6%
	Materials	24	18%
	Facilities & Services	27	20%
Institution	Services	62	64%
	Environment	35	36%
Students	Class Dynamics	16	41%
	Outside factors	8	21%
	Personal Factors	15	38%

In the Departmental group, organisational issues (communication within a department, timetabling, pre-course information) attracted almost half the comments with Facilities and Services (labs, reading rooms, learning centres), Content (relevance, amount of content, integration of subjects) and Materials (department handouts, text books, equipment), scoring between 20% and 12%. Assessment issues (assignments, marking, tests and exams), attracted little student comment at only 6%. It would appear from this that students are concerned with, or at least are prepared to comment on, organisational issues but are not ready to, or able to, comment on academic issues such as content, materials and assessment, especially assessment.

In the Institution group the quality of Institutional Services (library, cafeteria, student union) and environment (noise, air conditioning, signage) attracted the third and fourth largest numbers of overall comments after Lecturer professional practice and Departmental organisational issues which shows that Institutional issues do have an

impact on student perceptions of their learning. Institutional Services attracted twice as many comments as that for Institutional Environment.

The least number of comments were made about Students themselves, or issues affecting themselves. Of these comments most concerned Class Dynamics (41%), and Personal Factors (38%), with Outside Factors attracting only half the number of comments of these other factors.

These results reveal that, when given an opportunity through an open ended student-centred approach, students comment on a wide range of quality issues which concern the total learning milieu.

Part B Groupings of quality issues categorised according to what helped and hindered learning and suggestions for improvement.

The four hundred and twenty one comments made in the SGID processes were in response to the questions:

- *What helps your learning on this course?*
- *What hinders your learning on this course?*
- *What suggestions do you have for improving your learning?*

Figure 4 shows the proportion of comments for each of the questions.

Figure 4: Number of Comments Made for Each Question

Question	No. of Comments	% of all Comments
What helped your learning?	176	42%
What hindered your learning?	129	31%
What suggestions do you have for improving your learning?	116	28%

The students evaluation was more positive than negative with two fifths of the total comments being about what helped their learning whilst only one third were about what hindered. The remaining 28% of comments were suggestions about how to improve their learning which was only marginally less than the hindered comments. At first glance this suggests a critical faculty in students is that they are prepared to attempt to find solutions to issues which hindered their learning. Closer examination of this seeming correlation is looked at later.

In Figure 5, the numbers of comments about *helped*, *hindered* and *suggestions* have been collated into the four groups - Lecturer, Department, Institution and Students.

Figure 5: Number of Comments Made for Each Question in the Four Groups

Group	Helped		Hindered		Suggestions	
Lecturer	89	51%	25	19%	34	29%
Department	58	33%	44	34%	35	30%
Institution	16	9%	39	30%	42	36%
Students	13	7%	21	16%	5	4%

* Percentages are for each question

Half of the students comments about Lecturers were to do with what *helped their learning*, whilst only about a fifth were about what *hindered learning*. This is in contrast to the other three groups where, in each case, the students made more comments about things *hindering their learning* than *helping it* - Institution 30% to 9%, Students 16% to 7% and Department almost the same at 34% and 33%, respectively. The differential in the case of the Department is small representing fourteen more comments for *helped* out of a total of one hundred and two comments for the two questions. So the area that is traditionally focussed on in student evaluations, namely lecturers' practice, is clearly seen as helping learning and those areas not usually attended to (e.g. the students themselves) as hindering. One wonders what we have been missing

out on in terms of students' quality issues by focussing questions mainly on teaching practices.

In the Lecturer group more suggestions for improvement were made than comments about *hindrances* at a ratio of three to two. So despite definite satisfaction with lecturers students still have suggestions for improvement. In the Institutional group there were more *suggestions* made than either *hindered* or *helped*. This is the opposite to Department where there were less *suggestions* than either *hindrances* or *helped* although this is the closest relationship of all the four groups.

In the Student group, there were far fewer *suggestions* made than either *helped* or *hindered* comments. It would appear from these proportions of responses that students do not feel empowered to make suggestions regarding their own situation.

Figure 6 records the comments for each subgroup under the headings *helped*, *hindered* and *suggestions*.

Figure 6: Number of Comments Made for Each Question in the Subgroups of the Four Groups

Group		Helped		Hindered		Suggestions	
Lecturer	Personal Qualities	17	10%	1	1%	0	0%
	Professional Practice	72	41%	24	19%	34	29%
Department	Content	11	6%	2	2%	4	3%
	Organisation	12	7%	29	22%	19	16%
	Assessment	6	3%	2	2%	0	0%
	Materials	13	7%	6	5%	5	4%
	Facilities & Services	16	9%	5	4%	7	6%
Institution	Services	12	7%	23	18%	27	23%
	Environment	4	2%	16	12%	15	13%
Students	Class Dynamics	7	4%	8	6%	1	1%
	Outside factors	3	2%	4	3%	1	1%
	Personal Factors	3	2%	9	7%	3	3%

Students rated the Professional Practice of Lecturers as much more of a *help* than a *hindrance* to their learning. So it appears that the lecturers in this case study are performing at a most satisfying level in the perceptions of the students.

In Department, Organisation issues are seen to *hinder learning* more than three times as much as *helping learning* with the highest number of *suggestions for improvement* in the Department group (16%). This appears to be a major quality issue for students. Content, Facilities and Services, and Materials are seen to *help* slightly more than they *hinder* with the most *suggestions* being for Facilities and Services. Most of the comments here also relate to organisational aspects of Facilities and Services rather than aspects of their intrinsic value. The number of Assessment comments are small but of those here there are three times as many *helped* comments for Assessment as for *hinder* and no *suggestions for improvement*.

The Institution's Services and Environment are both seen to *hinder learning* more than they *helped learning* and both attracted a number of *suggestions*, with Services attracting the majority of comments in all cases. It must be stated here that contextual factors may have influenced both the number and type of comments about the Institution made by students. In one part of the campus, buildings and services had not been ready for the beginning of the academic year and students using those institutional facilities let their opinions be known. Therefore, it can be seen that the Institution is having a significantly adverse impact on the quality of learning in the eyes of its students.

Students commenting about themselves see Class Dynamics as *helping* and *hindering learning* almost equally - 4% and 6%, respectively - but offer virtually no *suggestions for improvement*. Outside Factors *help* and *hinder learning* almost equally, whereas Personal Factors mostly *hinder learning* and attract the most suggestions - albeit very few.

Section Two: CHANGE

SIN this study one of the criteria for effectiveness of the SGID method is the extent to which students perceive improvement in the form of change having taken place. The results in this section are concerned with monitoring student perceptions of change in relation to those issues students identify as hindrance to their learning and their suggestions for improvement. The statements which the majority of students perceived as not applicable in the post SGID phase have been excluded.

To identify **change**, the *hindrances to learning* and the *suggestions for improvement* made by students in the original SGID at mid-semester mid-course, were again presented to students at the end of the semester. The students were asked to indicate whether in their perceptions change had taken place. Comments about what helped their learning were excluded from this part of the study because what was being monitored was change or no change, not degrees of change. Thus, it was assumed that items that were identified as helping learning would continue to do so and to ask whether change had taken place since the SGID would create confusion. If something that helped, still helped, but only to the same degree, could it be deemed to have changed?

Figure 7 shows the proportion of students stating whether **change** or **no change** had taken place for each of the groups, Lecturer, Department, Institution and Students, with regard to *hindrances to learning* and *suggestions for improvement*. **Change** may indicate that for students actual change had taken place or that the issue, although not actually changed, had been addressed in some way to the students' satisfaction so that the students' perceptions had changed.

Overall, more **change** (59%) had taken place with *hindrances to learning* whilst with *suggestions for improvement* the amount of **change** and **no change** was perceived as virtually the same. In both *hindrances* and *suggestions*, more **change** took place in three of the four groups; the exception being Institution, with less than one third of students indicating **change** for both *hindrances* and *suggestions*. Therefore Lecturers, Department and Students themselves can be seen as being responsive to the data generated by SGID whereas the Institution is perceived as not responding. The possible reasons for this will be explored in the Discussion.

Figure 7: Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Change Percentage of Change in Groups

Group	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Lecturer	78%	22%	73%	27%
Department	61%	39%	51%	49%
Institution	31%	69%	29%	71%
Students	71%	29%	61%	39%
Totals	59%	41%	51%	49%

With both *hindrances* and *suggestions*, the greatest amount of **change** was with lecturers (78% and 73%, respectively), then students themselves (71% and 61%, respectively) and then Department (61 % and 51%, respectively). It appears those groups closest to the source of the data collection - the Lecturer and the Students are the most responsive. In all cases, the degree of change with respect to *hindrances* is mirrored by that for *suggestions*, that is, the lecturers score the highest amount of change with both hindrances and suggestions. Likewise, the Institution scored the lowest for both categories.

The results for **change** are now presented for each of the groups: Lecturer, Department, Institution and Students.

Lecturers: *This section deals with the group Lecturer comments. It reveals the amount of change students perceived had taken place.*

Summary of all Lecturer Comments

Of all the comments made by students a third were about Lecturers. Figure 8 shows the break down of these comments into *helped*, *hindered* and *suggestions* for the two Lecturer subgroups Personal Qualities and Professional Practice. Lecturers are perceived by students as *helping their learning* much more than *hindering learning*. Especially helpful is Lecturer Professional Practice, but despite this level of helpfulness students still had a reasonable number of *suggestions for improvement*.

Figure 8: Lecturer Comments

LECTURER	Of All Lecturer Comments						TOTALS OF ALL LECTURER COMMENTS	
	Helped		Hindered		Suggestions			
Personal Qualities	17	11%	1	1%	0	0%	18	12%
Professional Practice	72	49%	24	16%	34	23%	130	88%
Totals	89	60%	25	17%	34	23%	148	100%

Change in Lecturer Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement

It can be seen from Figure 9 that the students perceived **change** in approximately three quarters of the comments made about Lecturers. Whilst the one comment about the Personal Qualities of Lecturers, which was a *hindered* comment, was perceived as having a high degree of change.

This level of change is the greatest recorded for any of the groups so Lecturers can be viewed as being highly responsive to student feedback.

Figure 9: Lecturer Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Percentage Change by Lecturer Subgroups

Lecturer	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Personal Qualities	83%	17%	0%	0%
Professional Practice	78%	22%	73%	27%
Totals	78%	22%	73%	27%

Lecturer *hindrance* comments related to Lecturer Professional Practice and concerned: teaching methods, communication, classroom organisation, Lecturer availability, resource management and workload.

Where the numbers of students who indicated **change** and **no change** were close the comments concerned teaching methods and communication. There were no *hindrances* where the majority of students stated there was **no change**.

Of all the Lecturer

Professional Practice *suggestions for improvement*, most concerned teaching methods while others concerned communication, classroom organisation and resource management.

Of the suggestions, there were only three comments where students stated there was **no change**. These were to do with teaching methods: *more time must be spent on logbook*

HINDRANCES TO LEARNING
TEACHING METHODS: <i>lack of brief notes; sometimes mundane periods, i.e. switch off & lose attention; more involvement in morning lectures; inappropriate use of group discussion; more practical, hands on, everyday examples; not enough explanation of terminology; monotonous teaching methods, same method all the time, too much lecturer talk; self reliance in learning from learning objectives.</i>
COMMUNICATION: <i>slow feedback on first assignments; often no follow-up on queries or requests for information, e.g. grading assessment sheets; lack of information for assignments - format, possible resources, due dates - indecisive & inconsistent; inadequate written feedback.</i>
CLASSROOM ORGANISATION: <i>lectures and tutorials not finishing on time; not long enough breaks; classroom should be changed occasionally; lack of organised contact with native speakers</i>
LECTURER AVAILABILITY: <i>lecturer frequently not available outside of scheduled lectures; leaving class during self-directed learning</i>
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: <i>poor usage of switch system - light, video, TV.</i>
WORKLOAD: <i>too much homework.</i>

preparation, field trips or any outside activities; and classroom organisation: breaks in class - short 5 minutes to break it up.

Therefore it can be seen from the high level of change that Lecturers take students' suggestions seriously and respond to these almost as much as they do to the *hindrances*. This also might be a comment on the viability of student suggestions.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING LEARNING

TEACHING METHODS: examples of practical application to business communication in relation to business, more everyday examples in relation to everyday situations; more discussion about assignments, a few brief notes and hand-outs would be more useful and effective; more group work to allow for feedback and interaction; variation in teaching methods; tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments; it's our money, our choice, we are adults, treat us accordingly; only be expected to know things that we have covered; ask relaxed questions directed at people so they don't feel threatened; more student input in terms of course design and planning, more interesting lectures, perhaps more experiments, etc, concentrate on weak points; visit relevant places to the class; more visual information from TV news; use more active methods & activities in class; keep giving us extra homework; try to include revision of material taught earlier in course; teacher could speak at normal speed when using vocabulary already taught; we need more help with pronunciation.

COMMUNICATION: clarify verbally the objectives in the assignments, simplify technical handouts; consistency between tutors and classes; depth of research for assignments required to be explained and guidelines to get full marks; more written feedback, more direct feedback - "if it's not right tell us"; when giving feedback give constructive criticism as well.

CLASSROOM ORGANISATION: have a longer break, a short break in middle of class 2-5 mins will help improve concentration span; tutorials more structure, time to review process in tutorials.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: Tutors should know more about functions of video/slides.

Department: *This section deals with the group Department comments. It reveals the amount of change students perceived had taken place.*

Summary of Department Comments

Of all the comments made by students one third concerned Departmental issues. Figure 10 shows that the Department *helped learning* more than it *hindered learning* and 26% of comments were *suggestions for improvement*. By far the largest number of comments in any Department subgroup concerned Departmental Organisation, and most of these *hindered learning*.

Figure 10: Department Comments

DEPARTMENT	Of All Department Comments						TOTALS OF ALL DEPARTMENT COMMENTS	
	Helped		Hindered		Suggestions			
Assessment	6	4%	2	1%	0	0%	8	5%
Content	11	8%	2	1%	4	3%	17	12%
Facilities & Services	16	12%	4	3%	7	5%	27	21%
Materials	13	9%	6	4%	5	4%	24	17%
Organisation	12	9%	30	22%	19	14%	61	45%
Totals	58	42%	44	32%	35	26%	137	100%

Change in Department Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement

It can be seen from Figure 11 that the students perceived 61% **change** in Departmental *hindrances to learning* and with *suggestions for improvement* a 51% **change**. This was the third greatest change after Lecturer and Students themselves.

Hindrances:

Departmental Organisational issues attracted the most *hindrance* comments and **change** was stated as 64%, the third greatest amount of change in this group. Changes took place mainly with issues concerning timetabling (all timetable issues changed), length of classes (evenly split between change and no change), communication (mostly changed only one did not), and organisation of delivery (mostly changed only one did not.)

Figure 11: Department Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Percentage Change by Department Subgroups

Department	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Assessment	65%	35%	0%	0%
Content	79%	21%	58%	42%
Facilities & Services	49%	51%	50%	50%
Materials	45%	55%	46%	54%
Organisation	64%	36%	51%	49%
Totals	61%	39%	51%	49%

There was **no change** with organisation issues related to length of classes *not enough time in the computer room, course too concentrated for time span, 50 minutes is not long enough for some tutorials, classes too long and infrequent e.g. physics*. With assignments and costs there was **no change** with any of the *hindrances*, *hand in dates clash, assignments across course all handed in at once, anxiety in finding materials in library encourages competition; course fees too expensive, costs of materials need prior notice*. The one communication *hindrance*, *changes of time table when uninformed at the last minute is bad*, and the organisation of delivery *hindrance*, *not enough time in computer room* did not change.

It would appear that those issues most easily attended to, such as communication, organisation of delivery and timetabling, had been addressed, whereas, more difficult issues to change such as assignments, length of class and costs were not altered.

Hindrances:

Departmental Organisational issues attracted the most *hindrance* comments and **change** was stated as 64%, the third greatest amount of change in this group. Changes took place mainly with issues concerning timetabling (all timetable issues changed), length of classes (evenly split between change and no change), communication (mostly changed only one did not), and organisation of delivery (mostly changed only one did not.)

Figure 11: Department Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Percentage Change by Department Subgroups

Department	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Assessment	65%	35%	0%	0%
Content	79%	21%	58%	42%
Facilities & Services	49%	51%	50%	50%
Materials	45%	55%	46%	54%
Organisation	64%	36%	51%	49%
Totals	61%	39%	51%	49%

There was **no change** with organisation issues related to length of classes *not enough time in the computer room, course too concentrated for time span, 50 minutes is not long enough for some tutorials, classes too long and infrequent e.g. physics*. With assignments and costs there was **no change** with any of the *hindrances*, *hand in dates clash, assignments across course all handed in at once, anxiety in finding materials in library encourages competition; course fees too expensive, costs of materials need prior notice*. The one communication *hindrance*, *changes of time table when uninformed at the last minute is bad*, and the organisation of delivery *hindrance*, *not enough time in computer room* did not change.

It would appear that those issues most easily attended to, such as communication, organisation of delivery and timetabling, had been addressed, whereas, more difficult issues to change such as assignments, length of class and costs were not altered.

Suggestions for Improvement:

Students were fairly evenly divided with regard to *suggestions for improvement* concerning Department with 51% **change**. Within the subgroups greatest change was seen in content (*more practical work, more computer time, more balance in content*) then organisation, and facilities and services with materials recording the least change at 46%. This largely reflects the patterns for hindrances and change, except for assessment which attracted no suggestions.

SUGGESTIONS**DEPARTMENTAL ORGANISATION:****Organisation of Delivery:**

one person marking the tests for consistency of marking, flexible timetable at beginning of year to have general idea of what is expected, more different tutors to concentrate on different skills, meet more native speakers so we can understand current cultural thinking and actions.

Time-table: *for full timers more options as to class time, more convenient timetable to ensure we don't have large gaps, both classes at last period at end of the day- bad time to learn - move to different period; longer lunch hours;*

Length of Classes *more class hours - back to 40 hours in class and 20 hours out of class, split classes over two days - one hour per topic a day*

Assignments: *better organisation of each dept i.e.. handing out assignments, spread assignments out more evenly - re-time-table spread of assignments and tests to give time in between.*

CONTENT

: more emphasis on computer skills

FACILITIES & SERVICES

computer rooms not open in weekend and paper for printer available, study area in school of health, clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicated brain, colour TV and video in classroom

Institution: *This section deals with the group Institution comments. It reveals the amount of change students perceived had taken place.*

Summary of All Institution Comments

Of all the comments made by students 23% were concerned with the Institution. Figure 12 shows that the Institution issues *hindered learning* and there was a large number of *suggestions for improvement*. The majority of comments concerned Institutional services.

Figure 12: Institution Comments

INSTITUTION	Of All Institution Comments						TOTALS OF ALL INSTITUTION COMMENTS	
	Helped		Hindered		Suggestions			
Services	12	12%	23	24%	27	28%	62	64%
Environment	4	4%	16	16%	15	15%	35	35%
Totals	16	16%	39	40%	42	43%	97	100%

Change in Institution Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement

It can be seen from Figure 13 that students perceived a small **change** in Institutional *hindrance* comments and *suggestions for improvement* comments. With both *hindrances* and *suggestions*, Institution service issues were perceived as being responded to less than Institutional environment issues.

Most Institutional service *hindrance* and *suggestion* comments concerned the library and reading room, and the cafeteria. Other comments concerned the bookshop and other support services: *cashflow on this side of the campus there is none here, no pub, resources on other*

side of the campus and no study area - student lounge. With Institutional service comments students stated there was **change** at 19%.

Figure 13: Institution Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Percentage Change by Institution Subgroups

Institution	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Services	19%	81%	24%	76%
Environment	46%	54%	40%	60%
Totals	31%	69%	29%	71%

Half of the Institutional Environment *hindrance* comments were concerned with the internal classroom environment, for example, heating, desk and classroom size and stuffiness and the other half of the comments were concerned with the campus environment, for example, outside distractions, car parking, finding rooms. This indicates that students are equally concerned with all aspects of an institutions environment.

Students stated greater **change** at 46% with Institutional Environment *hindrance* comments. Most of this **change** was in the internal classroom environment: *OHP screen in an awkward place, the room lighting - the sun's reflection, lack of heating, cold, icicles hanging off the visual aids, uncomfortable learning environment*, whereas, the campus environment was perceived as **changing** less at 19% with change

HINDRANCES TO LEARNING - SERVICES

LIBRARY & READING ROOMS: *library inadequate in the Arch and Design building with limited resource materials, this is a big one for us, limited access to library services and facilities; library resources are bad, lack of relevant resources for our course; noise in library, and library too small; not enough photocopiers in the library; the section in the library is not useful; reading room hours too few, lack of books and information in resource and reading room;*

CAFETERIA: *Not enough variety of food in the cafeteria and often by 12.30 there is not any left; need more food and better food; better games in the cafe for the people who use the machines; food in cafe is too expensive and tasteless; cafe food sux and is too expensive.*

BOOKSHOP: *Restricted availability of required texts and texts not available at beginning of course; hours of the bookshop i.e. closed in the evenings.*

HINDRANCES TO LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT: *not enough car parking, noisy e.g. lawn mowing during the day, especially Monday mornings makes it difficult to stud, no taps for drinking water, too far from faculty*

INTERNAL CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT: *chairs and desks are uncomfortable, the classroom too small, stuffy and not enough seats for combined classes, room temperature too stuffy and then freezing.*

taking place for: *difficult to find rooms and outside distractions e.g. car alarms, lawnmower, cell phones.*

Suggestions for Improvement:

With Institution *suggestions for improvement* the overall change is low at 29% which is similar to that recorded for *hindrances* (31%).

Of the twenty three *suggestions for improvement* with the services sub-group, only three were perceived by the majority of students to have changed. These were the cafeteria: *more Asian food in cafeteria* (67% change), and the library: *to install more cassette tape recorders in the library* (56%) and *increase the number and variety of cultural texts in the library* (55%). Two further statements recorded 50% change and these again involved the cafeteria and library: *extend cafeteria hours early morning till late and more up to date books, magazines, videos, etc in the library and Learning Centre.*

SUGGESTIONS - SERVICES

CAFETERIA: *Have more food in the cafeteria; better and cheaper food. Better attitude of personnel. Another cafe that is sunny and another operator. Healthier food catering for vegans; better cafe food, more variety; cafeteria needs better seating and more interesting food selection and prices. Would like to have Coke and not just Pepsi*

BOOKSHOP: *Extend bookshop and resource room hours i.e. 8.00pm on campus*

LIBRARY: *Library noise on door fixed and silent areas monitored and one more photocopier; Academic environment needs to be supported by more resources; extension of library and study room hours; bring back the no stop shuttle service or improve access to the library; longer library hours open until 10:00pm; more materials relevant to this course in library and labs; more photocopiers in the library (there is always a big queue of students).*

ENTERTAINMENT/FITNESS FACILITIES: *more on campus entertainment e.g. pool tables and decent radio station; a bar. Hot toddy for all the colds we have, gym is too expensive and needs more facilities*

GENERAL: *More photocopy machines; we want a cash flow machine on this side of the campus; have cash vending machine for changing notes;*

SUGGESTIONS - ENVIRONMENT

INTERNAL CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT: *: bigger rooms, desks that are adjustable (the tall people especially felt that the desks were too low) and get the board fixed - too squeaky - minor point; air conditioning for summer.,*

CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT: *mow on Sundays; to improve the car-parking problem extend the area. move closer to the faculty and better parking facilities; designated smoking areas outside (10 people agree), more rubbish bins and empty ones that are there and outside seating under cover perhaps with picnic tables*

The remaining twenty-two statements all recorded a low level of change concerning the library, cafeteria, bookshop, entertainment/fitness facilities, cashflow and phone. Four of these being unanimous in this judgement these were "pie in the sky wants": *Sky TV in cafe, access to phone in blue house (preferably free), a pub and free tea and coffee.*

According to the majority of students only three of the fifteen Environment *suggestions* had changed: *shift OHP screen, improve heating system - hotties and milo, climatic improvement to rooms; get water facilities, don't like drinking in the toilets, free filtered water e.g. bottles.* With the remaining twelve Environment suggestions, three internal classroom environment and nine campus environment, students perceived **change** at 40%.

Students: *This section deals with the group Students comments. It reveals the amount of change students perceived had taken place.*

Summary of all Student Comments

Of all the comments made by students only a small number were about themselves. Figure 14 shows of these student comments perceived themselves as hindering their own learning more than helping and very few suggestions for improvements were made.

Figure 14: Student Comments

STUDENT	Of All Student Comments						TOTALS OF ALL Student COMMENTS	
	Helped		Hindered		Suggestions			
Class Dynamics	7	18%	8	21%	1	3%	16	41%
Outside Factors	3	8%	4	10%	1	3%	8	21%
Personal Factors	3	8%	9	23%	2	8%	15	38%
Totals	13	34%	21	54%	5	14%	39	100%

Change in Student Hindrance and Suggestions for Improvement.

It can be seen from Figure 15 that the students stated 71% **change** in Student *hindrances* and with *suggestions for improvement* there was 61%. This is the second highest amount of change after lecturers, therefore students were very responsive to their own comments.

With class dynamics (which students perceived helped and hindered learning almost equally) *hindrances* students stated there was an 80% change in areas concerning undesirable behaviour by classmates and lack of participation. The 20% stating **no change** concerned *interference in lectures - individuals asking personal questions and taking up time and students being late*. This is a significant finding in that it indicates a

potential strength of this method regarding empowering students to manage their own learning environment.

Figure 15: Student Hindrances and Suggestions for Improvement Comments and Percentage Change by Student Subgroups

Student	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Change	No Change	Change	No Change
Class Dynamics	80%	20%	100%	0%
Outside Factors	17%	83%	0%	0%
Personal Factors	69%	31%	455	55%
Totals	71%	29%	61%	39%

With student personal factors (which hinder a great deal more than help learning) *hindrances* students stated **change** at 69% these factors concerned students' personal qualities, for example, erratic study habits and their personal expectations such as not getting paid and not practising their language skills. The only personal factor where students stated there was **no change** was an expectation *lab reports not made compulsory and therefore not handed in for feedback*. Again this is a powerful finding in relation to student self empowerment.

HINDRANCES

OUTSIDE FACTORS: *The slowness of student services with loans, having to work outside UNITEC to earn money*

PARTICIPATION: *lack of group participation, not full class participation,*

UNDESIRABLE BEHAVIOUR: *annoying, argumentative, disruptive, uncompromising students waste valuable time, continual disruptions from chatterboxes in lectures, class noise too high, classmates distractions during lectures.*

PERSONAL QUALITIES: *Own personal motivation;; personal erratic study habits, stress at not being able to keep up with recommended reading, personal matters.*

PERSONAL EXPECTATIONS: *don't get paid - incentive, we aren't trying to speak Japanese as often*

Outside factors (which help and hinder learning almost equally) were mainly concerned with finances, and although the majority of students (79%) stated **no change** which one could say is expected because finances for students is a major difficulty not easily overcome. However, there are only two comments so the amount of change could be highly variable.

There are only four Student *suggestions for improvement*, one statement for class dynamics, *Whole class participation rather than one person answering it all; give us a chance* records 100% **change** and three concerning personal factors *We need to try to speak more language, e.g. in the breaks, more free talks with native speakers, and Everyone should get paid equally at the same time,* and students state there is 45% **change**.. Because of the low numbers any conclusions drawn can only be with regard to the total group Students.

Section Three: NOT APPLICABLES

S This section identifies those comments made in the SGID where the majority of Students perceived them as not applicable in the post-SGID follow up and also those comments which Lecturers considered not applicable.

Student Perceptions

Taking all comments across both *hindrances to learning* and *suggestions for improving learning*, twenty of the two hundred and forty five comments (8%) were perceived by the majority of students to be **not applicable** to comment on as to change (see Appendix E for these comments). So students felt they were able to comment on nearly all the issues they had raised.

It can be seen from figure 16 that Department attracted the greatest number (42%) of

Figure 16: A Break Down by Group and by *Hindrance* and *Suggestion* of those Comments Which Were Perceived by the Majority of Students as Not Applicable and by Lecturers as Not Applicable.

Group	Category	Student Perceptions		Lecturer Perceptions		Total No. Comments
		No.	%	No.	%	
Lecturer	<i>Hindrances</i>	0	0%	6	8%	25
	<i>Suggestions</i>	0	0%	0	0%	34
	Sub-total	0	0%	6	8%	59
Department	<i>Hindrances</i>	4	21%	8	10%	44
	<i>Suggestions</i>	4	21%	11	14%	35
	Sub-total	8	42%	19	25%	79
Institution	<i>Hindrances</i>	4	21%	16	21%	39
	<i>Suggestions</i>	1	5%	22	29%	42
	Sub-total	5	26%	38	49%	81
Students	<i>Hindrances</i>	5	26%	12	16%	21
	<i>Suggestions</i>	1	5%	2	3%	5
	Sub-total	6	32%	14	18%	26
TOTALS		19	100%	77	100%	245

such responses, with the student group next at 32% and the Institution group scored 26%. The Lecturer group attracted no comments where the majority of students felt it was **not applicable** to comment.

In an attempt to ascertain reasons as to why students felt it was not applicable for them to comment, the comments were examined and grouped under the following headings. In each case, the comments are grouped under each heading by group and subgroup.

Comments which students may not have been able to comment upon in the post SGID because the issue had not come up again in such a way that it was appropriate to state change or no change

Institution - environment

Too hot in the afternoon in the classroom (the season had changed)

Department Organisation

Long study breaks

Orientation time more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading etc

At Interviews and in course brochures be more specific about subjects we cover outside clinics costs etc

Expand the length of the course e.g. Jan. to Dec

Syllabus handed out at the beginning of the year

Too many students in the class

Many of these comments pertain to the beginning of a course or factors that could only be changed with a new intake of students.

Comments which were related to specific sectors of the student body, but where all students supported their peers in the SGID but were not able to comment about change or no change in the post SGID as it did not apply to them.

Student - outside factors

Other commitments - work, other subjects and sport means lack of personal time.

The slowness of student services with loans

More efficiency at Student Services - quicker with loans

These factors do not affect all students but the their support of these comments reveals they are obviously sympathetic to their peers.

Student - personal factors

English as a second language

Personal matters

Institution - service

Library hours - difficult for shift and fill time workers

Cafeteria food only for Westerners

Department - organisation

For full timers more options as to class times

A number of these comments are dependent on ethnic origin or whether students are part time or full time.

Comments where students registered lack of support at the time of the SGID and the same numbers recorded not applicable in the post SGID

Department - materials

The textbook explanations are difficult to understand - not detailed enough.

Big words in text books.

These comments may be less of a hindrance at the end of the course because the concepts are clearer due to being in the course longer.

Institution - services

Lateness of shuttle bus

Institution Environment

Designated smoking areas outside

Comments where students registered lack of support at the time of the SGID but different numbers recorded not applicable in the post SGID.

Students - personal factors

Own lack of study techniques

A number of these comments are dependent on whether particular services or areas are used or not.

Lecturer Perceptions

Figure 16 shows that Lecturers perceived seventy seven (31%) of the student comments **not applicable** to comment on as to change which is a great deal more than students. Institution attracted the greatest number of responses, at 49%, which the majority of students perceived as not applicable to comment on. The Department group is next at 25%, Students scored 18% and the Lecturer group attracted 8%. The latter score of 8% represents six comments and were to do with the lecturers own professional practice.

The comments that lecturers felt it was not applicable for them to comment upon are summarised below by group.

Lecturers stated it was not applicable to comment about their own practice in relation to six comments. These mainly concerned teaching methods - *fields trips, being treated as adults, allowing for student input* and classroom organisation *breaks in class* and controlling student behaviour. The only personal qualities comment made by students, lecturers considered not applicable.

With just over half (fourteen) of the comments students made about themselves lecturers stated it was not applicable for them to comment. Of these fourteen comments eight related to personal factors and five to outside factors. This indicates that lecturers were able to comment on those issues under class dynamics which is logical in that they are

able to observe in-class behaviour whereas the other factors are outside their range of observation.

For thirty-eight Institutional comments (environment eight and services twenty-five) lecturers stated it was not applicable to comment. The eight environment comments were to do with: parking, classroom furniture, heating/air conditioning and distance from the faculty, and the services comments concerned: textbook availability, the bookshop hours, the cafeteria games, variety and quality and cost of food, library noise, resources and photocopiers and other services such as cashflow machines, shuttle bus, pubs and the gym. This indicates that lecturers do not know what is going on in the wider experiences of students at the institution. This is probably realistic but begs the question of who is able to monitor these factors, especially as this is the group which students perceived as changing least.

For the Department, comments which lecturers stated were not applicable to comment on, were mostly to do with organisation and concerned events at the beginning of the year such as Orientation, interviews and brochures, this replicates the students not applicables. Also longer lunch hours, timetable options for part timers, the length of courses, cost of courses and assignment materials, organisation of course activities, communication between lecturers and classes, and anxiety about competitiveness in finding library materials were regraded as not applicable to comment upon.. The other subgroup within Department which Lecturers regarded as not applicable to comment on was content - things students felt it was unnecessary for them to learn, lack of and relevancy of textbooks ,more lab time needed and study area needed.

These results show that students were able to comment as to change on the vast majority of the comments they made and those comments which they felt it was not applicable to comment as to change can be grouped into three reasons: issues that had not come up since the SGID was conducted, issues which although supported by the majority did not pertain to the majority of students and issues that were not supported at the time of the SGID and still did not apply to the majority of students. Lecturers perceive themselves

as not able to comment on nearly a third (31%) of all the student comments, and most of these were in the Institutional group which is the group students perceive as changing least of all the groups.

Section Four: STUDENT AND LECTURER AGREEMENT

S This section identifies the lecturer agreement with students' perceptions of change or when issues were regarded as not applicable to comment. In this section all comments are used (see Appendix C). The reason for including those comments which the majority of students regarded as not applicable is that both students and lecturers may have regarded the same issue as not applicable.

Lecturer Agreement with Students about change

As can be seen from figure 17, lecturer agreement with students' perceptions of change with regard to *hindrances* was greatest with the two groups Lecturer and Students whereas, with Department and Institution there was less agreement with students perceptions. The *suggestions* replicates *hindrances* in that agreement was greatest for the two groups Lecturer and Students, and less agreement with Department and Institution. The lecturers responses to the student statements are recorded in the last two columns of the Appendices; specifically, Appendix D for all the data.

Figure 17: Amount of Agreement Between Lecturer and Student Perceptions of Change

	Hindrances to Learning	Suggestions for Improvement
Lecturer	88%	74%
Department	40%	49%
Institution	44%	40%
Student	52%	58%

Lecturer and Student Agreement in relation to the Lecturer Group comments.

For the Lecturer group, lecturer agreement with students for both *hindrances* and *suggestions* as to whether change had taken place, was highly correlated at 88% and 74% agreement, respectively. Where there was agreement both students and lecturers

stated there was **change**, and this was in the areas of teaching methods, communication, classroom management and resource management.

Most non agreement (eleven comments) was in the area of teaching methods where lecturers felt it was **not applicable** to comment.

There were only four comments where there was a difference in perception as to **change** and **no change**. Lecturers perceived **no change** and student perceived **change** with the following comments:

*Lecturer frequently not available outside of scheduled lectures;
Simplify technical handouts;
Lectures and tutorials not finishing on time;
Concentrate on weak-points,*

With only one comment did the lecturer state **change** and the students stated **no change**

More time must be spent on logbook preparation.

These results show that with regard to lecturer performance students and lecturers largely perceive **change** and **no change** in the same way.

Lecturer and Student Agreement in relation to the Department Group comments.

For the Department group lecturer agreement with students as to whether change had taken place or not was for *hindrances* 41% and for *suggestions* 49%.

Where lecturers and students did agree for both *hindrances and suggestions* (forty three comments), twenty-three comments were perceived to have **changed**. Of these twenty-three issues fifteen were organisational issues (organisation of delivery and timetable, six comments each; communication two comments and length of class one comment), two were about facilities and services (*the Learning Centre*) and five concerned *suggestions* from the subgroups content (three comments) and materials (two comments). With fourteen comments, both lecturers and students agreed there was no change. These concerned organisation with ten comments (assignments four, length of classes five and

timetable one) and four facilities & services. With six comments lecturers and students perceived them to be not applicable to comment on as they happened only at the beginning of the course.

For the assessment subgroup there was 50% agreement between lecturers and students on *hindrance* comments; there were no *suggestions*.

There were thirty-six comments where there was non agreement between lecturers and students across both *hindrances* and *suggestions*. With thirteen of these comments lecturers stated it was **not applicable** to comment (content one comment, materials three comments, facilities & services one comment and organisation eight comments). Of these, students stated **no change** for ten comments and with the other three comments students perceived **change**. With six of the comments where students and lecturers disagreed, students stated it was **not applicable** to comment. For three of these lecturers stated **no change** and for the remaining three, lecturers perceived **change** had taken place:

There were seventeen comments where there was a difference in perception as to **change** or **no change**. Lecturers stated **no change** and students stated **change** for five comments:

*Some data too technical eg graphs;
noisy in the learning centre - crowded;
under resourced;
Lack of adequate communication between tutors/students/other classes of the same subject;
Would prefer more lectures from Lecturer A.*

Lecturers stated **change** and students stated **no change** for the twelve other comments:

*Open hours of the computer lab not enough;
Computer room open in the weekends and paper for printer available;
Clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicate brain;
Lack of resources relating to animals i.e. models, examples in anatomy and physiology; The range of prescribed books presents some problems - not everyone with same books;
Up-to-date animal and anatomy videos;
Not enough time in the computer room,
Change of timetable when uninformed and at last minute is bad, timetable muck ups with inadequate notice;*

*Better organisation of course schedules - present content in right order e.g. anaesthetics too late;
 Spread assignments more evenly, re-timetable spread of assignments and tests to give time in between;
 More emphasis on computer skills.*

These results show the large amount of no agreement was largely due to either the lecturers or the students perceiving it as **not applicable** to comment. However, one third of the non agreement comments are a result of the lecturers perceiving **change** when the students stated **no change**. Even though the numbers are small this is an area of concern for if lecturer and student perceptions as to whether **change** has taken place are different then the two groups may be focussing on different aspects of the issue and therefore **change** from the students' perspective is very difficult to achieve even with the best of intentions on the part of the lecturers.

Lecturer and Student Agreement in relation to the Institution Group comments.

Lecturer agreement with students about change in Institutional issues is low at 46% for *hindrances* and 40% for *suggestions*. In half of the comments about Institutional issues where **no change** was indicated by students, lecturers thought it was **not applicable** to comment: Where they did agree, for both *hindrances* and suggestions (thirty six comments), both lecturers and students stated **change** with ten issues (environment seven and services three). For twenty three comments they both stated **no change** (environment five and services eighteen) and with three comments both stated not applicable; of these two were in the environment subgroup.

There were forty seven comments where there was non agreement in perception between students and lecturers. With thirty-five of these comments the lecturer stated it was not applicable to comment (eleven environment and twenty four services) and with all these comments students stated there was no change. There were four comments where students stated it was **not applicable** to comment. Of these, lecturers perceived **change**

for three of them and there was one comment when the lecturer perceived **no change** had taken place.

There were eight comments where there was a difference in perception as to **change** or **no change**. Lecturers stated **no change** and students stated **change** with two environment comments:

Get water facilities. Don't like drinking in toilets. Free filtered water difficult to find rooms.

For six of these comments lecturers stated **change** and students stated **no change**. Five of these were to do with environment:

*air conditioner for summer,
classroom too small,
stuffy and not enough seats for combined classes,
we need more space in the carpark,
the yellow bus is infrequent/inconvenient;*

and one with services

the section in the library is not useful.

In this section there is larger non agreement and most of this is attributable to the lecturer stating it was **not applicable** to comment, yet the students very definitely felt it was applicable to comment and comment they did - **no change**. This is of concern for the institution is responsible for quite a large number of hindrances to learning and if the lecturers do not perceive the issues as applicable to comment upon then who is picking up the responsibility on behalf of the institution?

Lecturer and Student Agreement in relation to the Student Group comments.

With the Student group, there is a 52% agreement between lecturer and student perceptions with respect to *hindrances* and 60% agreement for *suggestions*. They agreed on fourteen comments across both *hindrances* and *suggestions*. Where they both perceived change six comments were concerned with class dynamics and two with

personal factors, where they both stated not applicable the comments concerned outside and personal factors (three each).

There were twelve comments where there was non agreement between the perceptions of lecturers and students. Eight of these comments where lecturers felt it was **not applicable** to comment involved personal factors and outside factors; with most of these students perceived **no change**.

There were only four comments where there was a difference in perceptions as to **change**. With one comment the lecturer stated **no change** and students stated **change**:

not full class participation,

while for three comments lecturers stated there had been **change** but students disagreed:

*Lab reports not compulsory and not handed in for feedback,
interference during lectures individuals asking personal questions and taking up
time
more free talks with native speakers.*

There was higher agreement than non agreement in this group and actual difference in perception of **change** and **no change** is small.

Section Five: LECTURER INTERVIEW DATA

This section firstly reviews the Lecturer interview data and groups the responses under the seven interview questions. The interview statements are then looked at in so far as they pertain to, comment on, student comments.

Eleven lecturers were interviewed in this phase of the research project, all of whom had had SGIDs carried out on one of their classes. The interview with each lecturer generally took place between six to eight weeks after the SGID evaluation by which time the lecturer/s had discussed any issues and suggestions further with the class and had had the opportunity to make any changes.

The data from the interviews is transcribed in summary form following the structured interview format of the pre-prepared questions. The results are reported globally for the whole of the Institution. The questionnaire sheet used for the interviews appears in Appendix B-6.

Responses to the questions are aggregated as follows:

A1 How useful do you think the SGID process is in identifying quality issues?

Ninety-three percent of respondents regarded the SGID method as capable of capturing essential quality issues. Most of the lecturers ventured reasons as to why they thought this was so. These can be grouped under the following headings:

Group Process

Sixty percent of the respondents mentioned the group process and identified tangible benefits deriving from it, for example:

Because of the small group approach the students are more encouraged to participate. The students started with gut feelings about certain things and were able to formalise these feelings by talking things through which helped them to be more specific. Students are triggered by each other to bring up issues. Orally they are likely to say more than on paper.

*It's an exciting tool for all concerned because the students start to take ownership in a group sense for what they see as quality issues.
Peer moderation gives additional weight to students' comments - non- issues get filtered out by challenging peers.*

Open-endedness of the method

Twenty percent applauded the open-endedness of the method, for example:

*SGID allows for range and depth of content.
It allowed the students to come up with any issues that affected their education.
In the past, the evaluations that I had done had restricted or narrowed their vision.
The issues cover a whole range of what is foremost in people's minds.
It enables them to voice any gripes about anything.
It enables them to get any issues off their chests.*

Obtain specific feedback

Ten percent of respondents saw the usefulness in terms of getting specific feedback on their teaching, for example:

*It shows me what I need to do to improve the quality of service - where I need to give further attention.
It gives specific information which is very practical
I got positive feedback on what I was doing - a re-affirmation.'*

An individual comment was also made about the usefulness of the three SGID questions in *focusing the students* while another respondent felt that with this method

*students have time to consider the issues and that is what makes the quality of content so high.
You get a written report which summarises all the data as a consensus view.*

However, not all the comments were positive - some ten percent felt that while the SGID had generated a wealth of data, it was difficult to distinguish what the real issues were for students, for example:

*I was expecting them to come up with major issues that were upsetting.
(SGID) gives you the lot - quality issues and a lot of peripheral things too.'*

B 1 Are there any comments you would like to make about the SGID process as regards its value to you personally?

Motivating

Ninety-four percent of respondents attested to the real personal value derived from SGID and offered a range of supporting statements, for example:

It creates a compulsion on my part to do something, to act on those things I can change.

It's useful to me in terms of 'omission theory' - I have got support for what I'm doing that way.

It's a quality check and a re-affirmation of a process that is student-centred and owned by the students. I'm dealing with their strategies for action.

It encourages self-reflection - it's useful for my own planning and evaluation.

B2 Are there any comments you would like to make about the SGID process as regards its value to the department and the institute as a whole?

Eighty percent of the comment received by respondents made it clear that they felt the results of SGID evaluations were of real value both to their particular department and to UNITEC.

One respondent mentioned it as a useful way of *creating dialogue*.

It's a great way for the institute to open up the feedback process.'

Thirty-six of respondents expressed the value of SGID in terms of finding out more about the quality of service that the Institution provides, for example:

It's important in the monitoring of quality - it gives us what we've been asking for a long time, if we're serious about customer service, that is.

It focuses on total quality improvement and this is in keeping with UNITEC's goal. Its approach is participative and consultative. It will help raise the awareness about quality throughout the institute.'

However, about twenty-eight percent of respondents, while acknowledging the need to alert departments and institute to quality issues, nonetheless questioned the ability of them to respond decisively and action change.

For example:

I am not sure what happens when I pass the information on. The problem is the lack of a feedback loop (from the Dean back to me).

I do not think the powers that be actually take enough notice of it. You pass the information on but there is not feedback from departmental heads and faculty heads to address what the students have said or suggested.

Service people at UNITEC need to get this data and act upon it - neither is happening at present.

About ten percent of respondents alluded to instances where the department was powerless to act on the suggestions received by students, for example:

Some of the stuff the students came up with - for example longer holidays and lunch hours can't be changed. In these cases, I don't think the SGID will have much effect on the department.

C1 As a result of this study, some consideration may be given to using the SGID process to evaluate the quality of the TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROVISION at UNITEC (i.e. quality of instruction, quality of facilities, quality of environment).

To what extent is the SGID process able to give a complete picture about the quality of the total educational provision?

Twenty-six percent of respondents acknowledged the broader view by way of elaboration, for example:

It's important for the department and the institute to know the extent that departmental practices and services operate on a course.

Learning should be considered from various perspectives. Lecturers are made aware that students' learning relates not only to the department but also to the institute.

The SGID method gives students scope to comment on departmental facilities and UNITEC services. On most standard evaluation forms there is no space for this so no comments are heard.

Fifty-eight percent of the respondents felt unequivocally that SGID gave the big picture view, for example:

Valuable when it comes to seeing the factors that influence the students' learning

It addresses the broader environment (department and services) and not just instructional things.

Other forms of evaluation really focus on the curriculum; only SGID allows for greater scope of comment.

It allows the students to comment on all the factors which impinge upon their education. In the past, we've only looked at teaching, style and methods which is really far too narrow. I got comprehensive feedback via SGID on how I teach plus a whole lot of other things besides.

There is no other evaluation process that gives so much information.

Thirty-three percent of respondents qualified their comment by saying the potential for a complete picture existed if certain pre-conditions were there, for example:

The potential is for a very complete picture but the completeness of the picture is strongly determined by the motivation of the students to participate.

It will be complete if the scope of SGID (learning in its broadest sense) is outlined by the facilitator.

The timing is important ... if it (the SGID) is done too early it may not give you a complete picture - there may be very few things coming up for students then.

Fifteen percent of the participants made the point that certain students may not be exposed to certain aspects of educational provision, ie institutional services, because of the nature and timing of their courses, eg. part-time evening courses, for example:

A lot depends on the students - for example, ESOL students may focus more on the quality of teaching/learning than on the quality of services or the environment.

D Strategies for improvement

D1. Do the strategies for improvement as suggested by the students address the quality issues that they have identified?

About twenty three percent of respondents felt that about half the issues had been addressed by the students. They went on to suggest why issues had not been taken up by students, for example:

Students may forfeit making a suggestion if they feel nothing can be done about a hindrance.

Not every issue has a corresponding strategy for correction. Where there is no suggested strategy for improvement students may have no solution to the problem or maybe the problem isn't really that important.

D2 How viable are their suggested strategies for improvement?

Placed along a continuum, the responses were:

- None were viable: 5%
- Very few were viable: 11%
- Some were viable: 7%
- About half were viable: 12%
- Most were viable: 25%
- All were viable: 39%

Twenty-four percent of respondents approached the question of viability in terms of what they could personally act upon. In some cases, this varied considerably, for example:

For me about half are viable in that we can do something about them; because they are in our control.

Because there are very few comments about my teaching there's very little I can do to change things - it's all a bit out of my hands.

About eighteen percent of respondents regarded some of the students' suggestions as something of a 'wish-list' and hence impracticable, for example:

They (the students' suggestions) were a blend of workable and pie in the sky - for example, extra resourcing just isn't possible to the extent they expect it. Resource constraints are very real and students often don't appreciate this.

Some twenty-three percent accepted that while not being able to act upon everything they could at least pass the information on to those concerned, for example:

Other things are beyond our control but we can alert those responsible.

Twenty-five percent of respondents saw the very viability of the students' suggestions as assisting in the implementation of change, for example:

Because of the viability of the suggestions, change can be implemented quite quickly. In instances where it can't be made immediately, it can at least be planned for down the line.'

E. What are your thoughts regarding the widespread adoption and implementation of the SGID process at UNITEC?

Twenty eight percent of respondents felt that the method should be adopted and implemented by teaching departments. The reasons advanced by those recommending its adoption were as follows:

*We cannot get this information any other way and it is very effective.
Having to reach a class consensus means you should get reasonably accurate feedback from a class of students which you don't necessarily get from a written form.
Its strength is in having an external evaluator come in and do it.
I believe it is vital that we find out what students think about all our services.
The use of SGIDs by a staff member does indicate an interest in their own professional development.*

The time factor was seen to be an important consideration and many were concerned about this as noted by 25% of respondents, for example:

*It should be used sparingly with the same group of people because of the time it takes.
It may be a problem taking that amount of time out of a course to do a SGID - especially if it's a short course.'
It's time consuming also for the tutors - you've got your briefing, feedback time with the facilitator and then the post discussion with the students.
Facilitators too do them in their own time and voluntarily. You may not be able to return the favour.
Because of the time involved, it might be useful to use SGIDs to evaluate programmes institute-wide. For very short courses, it may be better to use evaluation forms which focus on the classroom environment*

However, respondents were divided as to whether it should be a compulsory requirement to use it. One respondent felt that for new teachers in the system the arduous nature of the SGID process might exacerbate feelings of insecurity. Forty-eight percent of respondents, having experienced the SGID process, expressed varied reservations about recourse to this one method of evaluation.

Some forty percent of respondents also questioned the frequency with which any one group of subjects could be subjected to the method, for example:

*I have a worry about how many times a student can go through this process.
It should not be overused - once a semester is enough with any one group.*

Forty percent of respondents went on to suggest that SGID should not be regarded as a sole means of evaluating courses but be used in tandem with other methods, for example:

It should be one tool among many.

We need to make use of an arsenal of investigative techniques.

Other methods that use an external facilitator could also be just as valid.

I support the idea of different forms of evaluation occurring throughout a course.

Individual respondents made the point that the SGID method could only be successful on a grander scale if supporting systems were in place, for example:

Any follow-up with SGID assumes good lines of communication with students and this is a variable that has to be watched. People have to be trained to give feedback to students.

If there is a decree on high to have SGIDs done then anxiety may build up. You need an environment of trust for them to work.

F. What Changes Are You [Lecturer] Aware of That Have Been Implemented as a Result of the SGID Process

Lecturers made a total of fifty-four interview statements which relate to eighty six student *hindrance* and *suggestions* comments (see Appendix F), that is, 20% of all student comments were directly commented on by lecturers in interviews. These comments were to do with changes which lecturers perceived had taken place.

In their interviews about change lecturers made most statements about their own practice, followed by Department and Institution with a fairly similar number of comments. Lecturers made relatively few comments about the Students themselves.

Interview Statements About the Lecturer Group of Comments

In the interviews lecturers made twenty statements which relate to thirty-one student comments about their practice. The comments show lecturers are positively responsive to student comments with regard to both *hindrances* and *suggestions*.

Of the thirty-one student comments the majority of students perceived **change** had taken place with twenty-nine of them whilst the other two comments were perceived by the majority as having **no change**. With regard to the latter two, Lecturers felt they had made an effort in both cases. On field trips the lecturer stated: *I made an offer but interest seems to have died as I have had no takers*, and regarding more time for log book preparation the lecturer stated: *I have taken time in class to deal with this*. Although the lecturer felt he/she had dealt with the suggestion the students were still not satisfied.

Interview Statements About the Department Group of Comments

Lecturers made seventeen statements in the interviews about Department which related to thirty three comments. With nearly one third of student comments (10 comments) lecturers stated they had passed on the information: *I have passed the information on and there has been some change* OR *passed information onto Department but not heard back yet* OR *just passed onto the Department or Information passed to course coordinator* these student comments concerning: the printer in the SDL area, technicians introduced, lack of resources, more lab time and the learning centre. Students perceived that there had been **change** with just over half of these comments.

With another third of student comments Lecturers stated the Department has responded in some way: *Procedures outlined to students and the course design will be taken on board by the Department and acted upon and We have responded as a Department to different timetable arrangements as requested by students and Timetable now given to students* and *Keep them posted as to what is happening in advance* and an explanation about *one person marking all assignments* which relate to student comments concerning lab access, in-class hours and timing of classes, students perceived **change** in half the cases.

With the remaining third of student comments lecturers made comments to the following effect: *Need to organise things differently in future, We have looked into extra resources, This has raised my awareness, Nothing can be done*. Students perceived a moderate change with these comments.

Although lecturers stated that they had been using videos in class since the SGID, students perceived **no change** had taken place. With another comment the lecturer had explained to students that if they wanted a kettle, etc, then they were welcome to bring one from home; the students were still not satisfied and stated **no change**.

Interview Statements About the Institution Group of Comments

In the interview, lecturers made fifteen comments which related to forty five Institution comments.

There were two interview statements relating to four student comments where lecturers stated that change had taken place but it was not as a result of the SGID. This was to do with heating, which the Institution was working on and by the end of the semester had succeeding in improving, for both lecturers and student, agreed **change** had taken place.

Three interview comments were to do with *passing on information for the Department agenda*, or *passing on information to the Library manager*, or *these are Institutional issues and I don't know what happened to them* and these related to twenty-seven student comments concerning resources (amount and placement), library, bookshop and services such as cashflow. Students perceived **no change** with any of these comments.

Four interview statements related to eight student comments about the cafeteria, either receiving a memo or letter or a visit from the manager. Of these, lecturers **stated no change** or **not applicable** with six comments and **change** with two. Students agreed with this. The two comments where **change** was perceived related to when the manager came and actually spoke to the students; this gives an indication what it takes to alter student perspectives.

With only three statements relating to five student comments did lecturers feel that they had some active part to play: *OHP now in better place, I have been pro-active and given a list to the library* and *I have passed the information onto the learning centre*. For these comments students had perceived **change**.

Interview Statements About the Student Group of Comments

In the interview lecturers made two comments which related to four student comments (4% of the 54 comments made). These concerned class dynamics and personal factors. Regarding the disruption of students, the lecturer clearly stated that *Classroom control is their baby*. With the other lecturer statement the lecturer commented on their personal observation *The students have tried to use their Japanese, I have noticed*. With both comments, students perceived **change** had taken place.

Within the Student statements was a class dynamic comment *Annoying, argumentative, uncompromising students waste valuable time* which was matched with a suggestion in the Lecturer group *Tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments*. The interview statement pertaining to these two comments was *I have been more aware of the one-to-one interaction with dominating students and feel more confident to intervene now*.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The aim of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of SGID as an evaluation technique for improving the quality of educational provision. It must be remembered that educational provision refers to the total student learning experience in an institution and that effectiveness and quality are defined from the students' perspective. Effectiveness is the extent to which an evaluation accomplishes what it intends to accomplish (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988), so effectiveness of an evaluation technique must be measured in terms of the *purpose* of the evaluation. Here, the purpose of student evaluations is to provide feedback so as to bring about improvement, and improvement in this study is defined as an increased level of change in the students' perceptions on those areas identified by them as needing improvement. To determine if SGID is effective in improving the quality of educational provision the results from this research will now be discussed in relation to the two main criteria which form the framework of this study. Firstly, does SGID provide information about the quality of educational provision so as to identify the quality issues from the students' perspective and therefore make overt the criteria students are using to assess the quality of educational provision. Secondly, does SGID contribute to the improvement of the quality of educational provision, that is, have the education providers responded to the issues which students state hindered their learning and have they taken note of the students' suggestions for improvement. The educational providers in this context include the lecturers, the department, the faculty, and the institution.

Quality Issues in Educational Provision

The results of this research reveal that, when given the opportunity through an open-ended, student centred approach to evaluation, students take a holistic view and make comments on a wide range of issues related to the total learning milieu - the lecturers, the department, institutional services and environment, and even about themselves as learners.

A search of the evaluation literature reveals that most student evaluations focus on the teacher and teaching and to a lesser extent on course evaluations. The emphasis on teaching practice and its impact on student learning has been well documented in the literature (Ramsden, 1990; Overall & Marsh, 1980; Biggs, 1990; Batten, 1994). The crucial place of lecturer professional practice in teaching and learning is supported in this study where issues such as *variety and range of teaching methods, support and advice, subject expertise*, attracted the largest number of comments. Baldwin (QHE Update, Nov 1993) notes that the students heavy focus on teaching is perhaps a function of the emphasis placed on formal contact hours by higher education institutions. Seminars are often compulsory and lectures are strongly recommended and therefore demonstrates 'what is important around here'.

What is revealing from this research is that the students regard departmental issues - which included comments about courses - as equally important to their learning as issues about the lecturer. Also, nearly one third of all comments refer to issues concerning the Institution and the Students themselves 21% and 9%, respectively. These results suggest that when their views are sought through an appropriate open ended process students will provide insights which no one else can and will take a wider view of what impacts on their learning than that generally recognised by educationalists. This is an important finding in relation to what are perceived as quality issues for students, and is very different to what educational institutions generally seek to evaluate in student evaluations.

This broad approach is supported by the results of the research of the QHE Project which concluded that it is the total student experience of learning that underpins assessment of quality in higher education (Harvey, 1993c). The total student experience goes beyond what happens in the classroom and teaching per se (Harvey, 1993d). What happens before the student enrolls and the institutional context in which the students learn (including issues such as institutional ethos, institution-based resources such as the library and the institution-based student services) all contribute to quality for teaching

and non teaching staff and students at the higher education institutions studied (Harvey, 1993a).

Astin (1985), Gustafsson (1988) and Dunkin & Barnes (1986) join this approach in their recommendation of a more holistic perspective on evaluation in education where students are asked to assess the total learning milieu. As the concern is with quality the need is to focus on the total student experience of learning and discover their issues which cannot be done by asking predetermined questions when the right questions to ask are not known (Hendershott & Wright, 1993; Hill, 1995). Thus to elicit this type of information, the inquiry must be based on open ended questions which allow the students to respond to their total learning milieu. The effort involved in transcribing and analysis of the data takes more time and is more difficult than standard evaluation techniques but the illuminative data it provides is well worth the time and effort.

This research shows that the organisational issues in the Department group (communication within a department, timetabling, pre-course information) attract the most comments from students. Far fewer comments were made about content (relevance, amount of content, integration of subjects), materials (department handouts, text books, equipment) or department facilities and services (labs, reading rooms, computer access and equipment). These three issues attracted a similar number of comments whilst assessment (assignments, marking, tests and exams) appeared as a minor quality issue for students.

It would appear from the proportions of these responses that whilst these students make many comments about organisational issues, they appear to be less vocal about academic issues such as content, materials and especially assessment. This finding is not consistent with the QHE Project where relevance, validity and fairness of assessment and course content relating to course objectives were identified as key elements of quality in higher education (Harvey, Burrows & Green, 1992). Possible reasons for this could be that these students feel a lack of confidence and qualification to comment on academic issues, or that they are in fact satisfied with the academic issues, or simply that they have never

been asked before so do not think to comment. Turning first to the students possible lack of confidence and qualification to comment on academic issues they may therefore be content to leave these issues to the prerogative of educationalists. This hypothesis is supported by an analysis of the suggestions for improvement made by students. Those areas which have the most suggestions - Lecturer professional practice, Departmental organisation, Institutional services and environment and Department facilities and services - are all ones that have organisational-type issues or where students feel confident to make comments. Such areas are those involving Lecturer professional practice where the students have years of subconscious and conscious criteria to assess lecturer professional practice against. All other areas which were academic ones attracted less than ten comments. Turning next to the possibility that students are satisfied with the academic issues. Figure 5 in the Results, indicates that students rate content, materials and assessment as helping slightly more than hindering their learning in this institution which would support this hypothesis. A further possibility could be that students have not been asked about academic issues before as the focus of evaluations is usually on lecturer practice. This is of concern if true, especially when so much time and input goes into content, materials and assessment at individual, institutional and national level.

With regard to what is referred to here as Department facilities and services, that is, labs, Information Technology facilities and services and Department organisational issues relating to efficient management of programmes, the QHE Project also found these issues were important criteria of quality. In fact, they were regarded as key elements in the quality of higher education (Harvey, 1993d).

The quality of the Institutional services (library, cafeteria, student union) and environment (noise, air conditioning, signage) attracted the third and fourth largest numbers of overall comments after Lecturer professional practice and Departmental organisational issues. The emphasis given to Institutional Services replicates the QHE Project findings where the library resources, library staff and library access were identified as key elements of quality. This shows that institutional services do have an

impact on student learning, and although not supported by the QHE Project, these students also commented on the Institutional environment, albeit to a lesser extent. However, in the QHE Project Institutional surroundings, which here equate to Institutional environment, was an issue regarded as of small importance as a criterion of quality.

The least number of comments were about the students themselves, with class dynamics (relating to each other) and personal factors (especially personal motivation) given approximately the same level of importance. Outside factors (having to earn money to pay fees) is the least commented upon. This relatively small number of comments about themselves is perhaps because students do not see themselves as being responsible for the quality of their education or because previous experiences of evaluations do not invoke comments about the learners themselves. Further research would need to be conducted to explore the possible reasons.

Dahllof (1991) states that, whilst students have the right to demand the highest quality this is on the proviso that students themselves are prepared to work hard and that the outcome of efficient learning is entirely dependent on student motivation to work hard and their willingness to participate. Baldwin's research (QHE, Update, Nov, 1993) with thirty two undergraduate students at Lancaster University reveals that nearly all the students thought the quality of higher education was at least in part dependent upon the effort that the students put into their own education. In this research, the large differences in proportion of comments about Lecturer and Department on the one hand, and the Students on the other, may indicate who and what students see as being principally responsible for their learning. This is of major concern if students do not see themselves as responsible, especially when in New Zealand educational approaches in tertiary institutions are increasingly requiring learners to be more self directed and motivated to take more responsibility for their own learning.

This research shows that, when the students themselves generate the criteria of the quality of educational provision, they reveal the criteria which are being poorly evaluated

or not evaluated at all by methods using predetermined criteria. Nevo (1995) likened this to Freire's *banking* concept of education where teachers try to deposit knowledge in their students' heads - education will not learn very much from evaluations which try to deposit their descriptions of reality and judge its value. By an open ended, qualitative approach the information can represent students in their own terms and provide an understanding of the total educational provision. Twenty percent of the lecturers who took part in this project, when interviewed, applauded the open endedness of SGID.

They made comments such as:

allows for range and depth of content, It allowed the students to come up with any issues that affected their education, The issues cover a whole range of what is foremost in people's minds.

Also, sixty percent of lecturers identified the group process as being instrumental in giving what they considered valuable information, as shown by the following interview comments:

The students started with gut feelings about certain things and were able to formalise these feelings by talking things through which helped them to be more specific, It's an exciting tool for all concerned because the students start to take ownership in a group sense for what they see as quality issues, Peer moderation gives additional weight to students' comments - non- issues get filtered out by challenging peers.

It can be seen from their comments that they also acknowledge the tangible benefits deriving from the group process, that is, it benefits the learning process by encouraging students to think critically about their courses and their involvement in it.

What Helps Learning? What Hinders Learning? Suggestions for Improvement.

The students were asked to categorise their issues in response to the three questions - *what helped your learning, what hinders your learning and suggestions for improvement*. Both the factors that help and those that hinder are important in the context of change (Aspinwall et al, 1992). This categorisation enables the respondents of the feedback to maximise their strengths and to target the issues needing

improvement, and these are supported by the students supplying solutions by way of suggestions for improvement.

Student comments reflect the nature of the implicit theories that students hold about what is good teaching, but how valid are their views? Good teaching is a difficult concept to validate as research shows that a list of measurable teacher behaviours cannot be produced. Good qualities can be listed but they are subjective judgements, hence educationists have not reached a consensus (Anderson & Burns, 1989); it is an elusive question which has generated a multitude of answers. However, surveys using different techniques have found that students at high school and college have a remarkably consistent concept of effective teaching (Batten, 1989; Clark, 1987; Wragg & Wood, 1984). However, there is real concern that student feedback in the form of ratings are becoming *de facto criteria* of teaching effectiveness (Doyle & Whitely, 1974).

Of the total comments made by the students in this study, more comments were about *what helped their learning* than *what hindered learning* - 38% to 31%. This could indicate a positive level of satisfaction amongst these students about their learning at this institution. There were fewer comments for *suggestions for improving learning* than for *hindrances or helped comments*. The suggestions broadly related to the hindrances stated and rarely raised other issues.

Half of all the helped comments pertained to Lecturer professional practice and personal qualities (approachability, openness, enthusiasm). Although lecturer personal qualities were stated as helping, the numbers were not very significant (10%). For students, the greatest number of helped comments dealt with Lecturer professional practice. It is not a revelation that lecturer characteristics have an effect on students' attitudes towards a specific course but studies have shown that, despite lecturer personal qualities of being warm, friendly and humorous in the classroom, students will frankly criticise such lecturers if their courses or methods are not well organised and stimulating (Aleamoni, 1976; Costin et al, 1971; Grush & Costin, 1975; Perry et al, 1979; Ware et al, 1977).

Hindrances to learning for Lecturer professional practice represented only 19% of all hindered comments. From the results of this study, it can be stated that the lecturers evaluated were perceived by students as being effective in helping learning. However, the other three areas - Department, Institution and Students - were perceived as hindering learning more than helping learning. So the area that is most focussed on in students evaluations (lecturer practice) is clearly seen as helping, whilst those not usually attended to are hindering. Further research would need to be conducted to discover why this is so but possible explanations could be attributed to the fact that Department, Institution and Student issues are not the focus of 'usual' student evaluations and further, that the quality of these issues has only been evaluated and monitored from the perspective of administrators.

In the Department group, the difference between helped and hindered comments is small. This small difference exists because the academic issues around content, materials and assessment are all perceived as helping learning slightly more than hindering learning. The issues involving departmental organisation are what students mainly commented upon as hindering learning and has the largest proportion of all the hindered comments.

The Institution was perceived as hindering learning a great deal more than helping learning and the majority of these comments related to Institutional services which was the third highest number of hindrance comments after Department organisation and the Lecturer. It must be stated here that contextual factors may have influenced both the number and type of comments about the Institution made by students. In one part of the campus, buildings and services had not been ready for the beginning of the academic year and students using those institutional facilities let their opinions be known. Therefore, it can be seen that the Institution is having a significantly adverse impact on the quality of learning in the eyes of its students.

Students saw themselves as *hindering learning* a great deal more than *helping learning*. Class dynamics (working in groups, getting feedback, discussion) and Outside factors (part time work, getting pressure of other commitments) were seen to help and hinder

learning almost equally, whereas Personal factors (study habits, lack of money, own motivation) mostly hinder learning. As these students consider issues around themselves hinder their learning, it is important that there is a forum where these issues can be articulated as a first step towards self reflection, especially as the issues in the personal and Outside factors groups are beyond the sphere of institutional influence and only the students themselves can attend to them. Eaton & Pougiales (1993) state that when courses and classrooms are consciously designed to further self evaluation a critical shift occurs in student autonomy and responsibility. He extends this further by describing the three elements that transform an education experience into meaningful learning: encouraging students ownership of their work, promoting reflection on that work and creating a sense of community in the class. The SGID process allows for these elements by allowing students to generate the evaluation criteria so that there is ownership and reflection and a sense of community in that the process requires the class to come to a consensus through debate and discussion as to which issues go forward as feedback.

The third question in the SGID process, *What suggestions do you have for improvement?* gives an opportunity for students to provide suggestions for improving their courses. The evaluation literature presents studies that show that when student feedback includes suggestions it increases the effectiveness of the feedback in bringing about change. From their interviews seventy-six percent of the lecturers involved in this study stated that half or more of the suggestions made by students were viable options. The lecturers made such statements as:

Because of the viability of the suggestions, change can be implemented quite quickly. In instances where it can't be made immediately, it can at least be planned for down the line

Eighteen percent of lecturers regarded some of the student suggestions as something of a *wish list* and therefore impracticable, as recorded in the following interview comments:

They (the students' suggestions) were a blend of workable and pie in the sky - for example, extra resourcing just isn't possible to the extent they expect it. Resource constraints are very real and students often don't appreciate this.

A critical factor in demonstrating the degree of involvement of students in this evaluation process is represented by their attempts to form, for the most part, viable solutions to issues that they perceive as hindering their learning. The results of this research show

students are prepared to offer suggestions even when they are very satisfied, for despite a very definite satisfaction with lecturer practice, students still had suggestions for improvement. Twenty-nine percent of all suggestions related to Lecturer professional practice. Perhaps this confirms that students are discerning and can identify aspects of poor performance and can come up with ideas for putting them right.

The number of suggestions for improving Departmental issues were slightly less than helped or hindered learning comments. This is the closest relationship of all the four areas. The majority of suggestions were about organisational issues, as is to be expected considering the larger number of hindrances in this area. Collectively, Institutional services and environment, with slightly more for services than environment, attracted the most suggestions for improvement of any of the groups.

Students made virtually no suggestions for improvement for any issues about themselves. This could be for a variety of reasons. For example, they do not see themselves as empowered to change anything or, as previously stated, they see lecturers and departments as principally responsible for their learning and not themselves.

Change As a Response to Student Feedback

The design used to monitor change in the present study is the SGID process, (the entire process from the initial discussion with the lecturer, collection of information from students in the classroom, and the two feedback loops, one by the facilitator to the lecturer and the other when the lecturer feeds back to the students) and the post SGID when the effects of the responses to the feedback are monitored by the **change** or **no change** decision of students. The typed up transcript of the SGID raw data was adapted to form a questionnaire on which students could individually assess each statement made as to **change** or **no change**. Only *hindrance to learning* and *suggestions for improving learning* comments were included in the questionnaire. It was deemed inappropriate to monitor change with respect to the statements identifying items which had *helped*

learning. It may have been interesting to evaluate such change, but it was decided to leave it out because it would have been monitoring a different type of change, i.e. has the helpfulness continued, improved or regressed. If the *behaviour* had simply continued, no change would have taken place giving a spurious result in terms of the change being measured for this research.

Change denotes whether the issue incorporated in the statement has been addressed or not and includes “satisfactory explanation” of the issue whether actual change has taken place or not. A third category, **not applicable**, is included. This category allows a response from students who did not originally support the statement as well as responses for issues that no longer exist, or no longer are of concern, since the SGID was carried out. Such an issue may be one which commented on heat and sun which was no longer a problem when the follow up took place in late autumn; or a comment on orientation which only relates to the start of the course. Lecturers were also given the same follow up questionnaire so their perceptions of change with respect to the student identified issues could be elicited.

This design has the disadvantage that it cannot control the reactive effects of the SGID on the student assessors, that is, it is not possible to tell whether the results of the post-SGID are directly a result of the process and any changes that are made or whether the results on the post-SGID could have resulted from a knowledge of the issues and the students reacting to them, rather than any discernible changes made by the respondents of the feedback. Also, it is impossible to gauge whether some of the changes would have happened anyway or are the result of other factors. An example of this was identified by the lecturers in their interviews regarding the Institutional environment and heating, students from one faculty made a number of comments that the lack of heating in the building was hindering their learning. The institution was already working on this issue so the change was not in anyway attributable to the SGID process. The students, however, were not aware of this.

The assumption in this research is that the SGID process incorporates nearly all the conditions that produce effective feedback as stated in the evaluation literature and therefore the changes can be assumed to be largely as a result of the method, that is the sum of all the parts of the SGID process are what makes it an effective process. Also, there is a second assumption that the SGID process could influence the departments and the institution in that those issues and conditions that aid individual lecturers to change are also effective conditions for the department and institution to change. Furthermore there is an assumption that students will be sensitive to any change and will have the ability to record that change on a “**change, no change or not applicable**” continuum. Student sensitivity to change should be aided by that part of the process feedback loop where the lecturer feeds back to students information about what is going to happen regarding their issues.

The point of the ‘change’ question is to discover the effectiveness of SGID evaluation method in bringing about change in the perceptions of students. Changes require a response by the various parties engaged in the learning milieu - lecturers, department, institution and the students themselves. The majority of students stated they perceived more change than no change with hindrances and suggestions for the three groups - Lecturer, Students and Department, in that order. Within the Institution group there was little change with both the hindrances and suggestions for improvement.

The most responsive in terms of change were the Lecturers and Students. Less responsive were the Department which was only moderately responsive, and lastly the Institution which was not very responsive at all. Therefore, it can be stated that those closest to the source of the evaluation - that is the lecturers and students - change the most, and the further away from the source the less the change.

Lecturer Issues and Change

Lecturers were highly responsive as perceived by the majority of students. There were no hindrances comments that students perceived as not changing and only three suggestions that did not change. With two of these suggestions Lecturers stated in their

interviews that they felt they had made an effort and addressed the issues. On field trips the lecturer stated,

I made an offer but interest seems to have died as I have had no takers,

and regarding more time for log book preparation the lecturer stated,

I have taken time in class to deal with this.

Yet the students were not satisfied with the lecturer's efforts or response with regard to these issues.

What is it that makes lecturers so responsive? Firstly lecturers are expected to respond. This expectation comes from both the students and the lecturers themselves. This is probably a manifestation of the thinking that lecturers are responsible for how their students progress in their classes rather than viewing learning and teaching as a two way process. This attitude has also manifested itself in the focus of the vast majority of student evaluations of their learning situations which are actually only evaluations of teacher performance. The literature tells us that when the users of an evaluation are fully involved in establishing an evaluation process it is more effective in bringing about change. The lecturers in this study were expected from the beginning, as part of the SGID process, to have a commitment to take the student feedback seriously and respond to it where they could.

Also, the SGID process involves the feedback being augmented by a third party who is the facilitator of the SGID data collection in the classroom. This facilitator is chosen by the lecturer and, as part of the first feedback loop, the lecturer and facilitator discuss the student feedback and put it into three baskets - what can be changed, what will attempted to be changed and what it will be very difficult to change and then discuss an action plan of how these changes might take place. This dialogue helps lecturers to know how to improve and aids the reflective practice of lecturers. Nevo (1986) suggests that lecturers are not motivated to use evaluation feedback that is presented to them as a coercive discourse of description or judgement. Therefore, such dialogue as described in the SGID process, is helpful for two reasons - to provide a better learning process to understand reality and to increase the motivation to use what has been presented.

It is essential to elicit the motivation of those responsible for the educational provision if improvement is to take place. Ninety four percent of lecturers in their interview statements attested to the real personal value derived from SGID in that it encouraged motivation and self reflection, as evidenced in the following comments:

It creates a compulsion on my part to do something, to act on those things I can change, It's useful to me in terms of 'omission theory' - I have got support for what I'm doing that way, It encourages self-reflection - it's useful for my own planning and evaluation.

However, whilst the majority of lecturers felt the SGID process motivated them, they were less convinced that it generated responsiveness at the department and institution levels. This intuitive perception is borne out to a large extent in these results.

Perhaps an aspect of the SGID process which contributes to the high motivation of lecturers, and therefore their responsiveness to change, is that they perceive the other influences on students' learning are recognised and acknowledged and hence they alone are not held accountable for the quality of students' educational experience. This hypothesis is supported by eighty four percent of the lecturers in their interview comments which revealed that they value the *big picture* perspective of the student feedback, for instance:

Learning should be considered from various perspectives. Lecturers are made aware that students' learning relates not only to the department but also to the institute, It addresses the broader environment (department and services) and not just instructional things, It allows the students to comment on all the factors which impinge upon their education. In the past, we've only looked at teaching, style and methods which is really far too narrow. I got comprehensive feedback via SGID on how I teach plus a whole lot of other things besides.

If lecturers perceive that an evaluation is reasonable in that the extent of their influence is acknowledged, and they are therefore satisfied with the outcome of the methods used, then the feedback will have greater prospects of being considered (Maier & Hoffman, 1964; Kulik, 1977; Braden, 1987). This appears to be yet another condition which increases the effectiveness of student feedback in bringing about change.

Twenty five percent of the lecturers in their interview statements also stated that the information was particularly useful in that it gave specific feedback on their teaching. They made such comments as:

It gives specific information which is very practical, It shows me what I need to do to improve the quality of service - where I need to give further attention, I got positive feedback on what I was doing - a re-affirmation.

Specific feedback which gives detailed, in-depth and holistic description is another condition which makes feedback effective according to the evaluation literature.

The student comments about lecturers have been grouped into specific areas and those areas which attract the most comments in both hindrances and suggestions are to do with teaching methods, classroom organisation and communication. Two of these three areas were also the focus of attention by students in research carried out in Scotland (Batten, 1989) where students comments fell into three main categories - classroom management, teaching methods and pupil involvement). This finding is consistent with the present study's data as students perceived change had taken place in each of these areas although the **change/no change** perceptions of students were closely divided in terms of teaching methods and communication.

Student Issues and Change

Students perceived that there was a high level of change with both hindrances and suggestions relating to themselves. This was the second highest level of change after that for lecturers. Greatest change was with class dynamics which concerned undesirable behaviour by peers and lack of participation; this indicates the potential value and power of the SGID process in enabling students to manage their own learning environment and hence assume a degree of responsibility for their learning. During the SGID data collection phase in the classroom, students in groups express their views about each other on paper and then these issues are revealed for all to read, discuss and debate. The comments in this research have all been supported by the majority of students in the consensus seeking stage, where they hear what they, as a group, do and say that helps

and hinders the learning of others. It is a significant feature of this process that the majority of students perceive issues around class dynamics as having changed indicating the potential self regulatory power of the process. This could mean the students are responding and becoming more involved in the learning process although this is not always the case. In one instance students recorded the following comment as a *hindrance to learning*:

Annoying, argumentative, uncompromising students waste valuable time,

In making a *suggestion for improvement* with regard to this issue they clearly handed over the responsibility to the lecturer to do something about it by stating that:

Tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments.

Students also perceived issues about Personal factors as having changed to a large extent which could signal the ability of the process to encourage students to be self reflective about their own issues - e.g. their motivation, their personal study habits. Perhaps the dialogue with students in the SGID process has helped the self regulatory notion in two ways. Firstly, the dialogue amongst themselves when generating the data can be viewed as a forum to express how their behaviour in the classroom influences others' learning. Also, owning up to personal factors such as lack of study skills or English as a second language is the first step towards self reflection. Secondly, the lecturer is contracted to provide feedback to the students in the classroom and this feedback loop may contribute to creating a commitment for both the lecturer and students to change. Studies have shown (Friedlander, 1978; Abbott et al, 1990) that this condition - discussing the evaluation feedback with the class - does make student feedback more effective in terms of bringing about change.

Outside factors mostly hinder and did not change, but the numbers for analysis here are low because with a number of these comments the majority of students perceived it was not applicable to comment on. Perhaps low change is to be expected regardless, because most of the comments concerned finances and this is not easily changed, especially in the period of time between the SGID and the post SGID data collection.

Students taking responsibility for themselves as learners is important because of the need for students to become autonomous to cope with the increasing demand in higher education for self directed learners. Dahllof (1991), states it is the function of higher education institutions to provide students with the necessary tools for learning - content, stimulation, clarification and advice, but it should be equally clear that the outcomes are entirely dependent on the students own willingness to participate in teaching activities, to undertake private study and to be responsible for seeking clarification and advice when they encounter difficulties. If this is the case then it is vital that teaching practice, curriculum and policy reflect this notion of shared responsibility and this includes the manner in which student evaluations are conducted and perceived.

The number of suggestions students generated, especially in the Institution group which they perceived as hindering their learning most, and the fact that there were only a few comments which they felt it was **not applicable** to comment upon, indicates the high level of involvement students achieve when given the opportunity. Students felt able to comment as to change on nearly all of their issues (925 of them), whereas lecturers perceived it was not applicable for them to comment on nearly one third of all the student comments.

When analysing the comments which students felt it was **not applicable** to comment on in the post SGID, they fell into three categories. Firstly, issues which had not come up again in such a way that it was appropriate to state change or no change - for instance, when the season had changed

Too hot in the afternoon in the classroom

or issues around the orientation time

Orientation time more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading etc

Second, issues which related to specific sectors of the student body such as, ethnicity or being a part timer, where all the students gave support to the comment in the SGID but were not able to comment as to change because it did not apply to them , for instance:

English as a second language, Library hours - difficult for shift and full time workers.

These issues were not necessarily identified as important to all students but from their support at the time the SGID was conducted it indicates that they do not think the issues are irrelevant. Thirdly those comments which registered lack of support at the time of the SGID and therefore did not apply to the majority of students so they responded not applicable, for example:

Designated smoking areas outside, own lack of study techniques.

With regard to student Personal factors and Outside factors lecturers mostly perceived these as not applicable to comment which is logical in that it was clearly unsuitable for lecturers to comment upon issues that relate to the personal experiences of students on which lecturers are not well placed to comment. Lecturers felt able to comment on issues relating to Class Dynamics, which are more suitable because they are able to observe this behaviour. This was reinforced in Lecturer interview comments by such statements as:

The students have tried to use their Japanese, I have noticed, Classroom control is their baby, I have been more aware of the one-to-one interaction with dominating students and feel more confident to intervene now.

This last comment is rather powerful in that a lecturer felt able to intervene in class dynamics because the students have sanctioned it openly and it was generated from their process spontaneously.

Department Issues and Change

The results of this research showed that the Department group issues help and hinder learning almost equally. The subgroups- assessment, content, materials and facilities help slightly more than they hinder - but organisational issues mostly hinder learning, so this is the area where greatest change is needed.

Students perceived that the subgroup “content” had changed the most with regard to both *hindrances* and *suggestions*. Content issues related to technical data, more practical work, and more balance in content. Lecturer perceptions as to the amount of change is fairly evenly divided whereas students perceived a high level of change at

seventy nine percent. This difference in perceptions suggests that perhaps the content did not actually change a great deal, but what did change was the students' perceptions as they progressed through the course. If the data at mid course appeared to be too technical and some topics irrelevant, by the end of the course their perceptions may have changed. This possibility is supported by the "material" subgroup where issues such as "big words in texts" and "difficult text books explanations" were hindrances at mid course, yet by the end of the course the majority of students felt it was not applicable to comment. Here again, perhaps as the course progressed the students had become more familiar with the materials and therefore although no external change had taken place these issues were no longer a hindrance because they had changed. Change with issues such as these cannot be attributed to SGID, because they may have happened anyway and the fact that they are raised is a result of the mid-course timing of the evaluation. Likewise, formulating the problems during the SGID process may aid the internal changes. Mid-course timing of evaluation is a condition which is regarded as being conducive to increasing the effectiveness of student evaluations in that there is time for improvements to take place by the end of the course.

With the subgroup "assessment" there was high level of change but the small numbers mean the results need to be treated with caution. With Materials there was little change and with Facilities and Services students were equally split between **change** and **no change**. These issues were to do with lab access, printers, lack of resources, cost of texts, up-to-date resources and relevant texts, all of which can be difficult for departments to change as they are dependent on human and technical resource allocations. Issues such as these can often only be resolved at a superordinate level in the institution.

The dependence of departments upon decisions and resources from higher up the hierarchy within the institution is also apparent in the change results in the department organisation subgroup. The **change** with *hindrances* in this subgroup was perceived by students as reasonably high and with *suggestions* almost equal **change** and **no change**. Within this subgroup those areas of organisational delivery and communication in both

hindrances and suggestions changed, whereas, in the areas of length of classes, timetabling, assignments and costs, students were closely divided as to their perceptions of **change** and **no change**. All these things are difficult to change, for example, the issues of timetabling and length of classes would require a major upheaval mid-course; this is an unrealistic expectation but could be valuable feedback for future courses.

Lecturers in their interview comments acknowledged that the student feedback had lifted their awareness of student issues about the department and the need for change in the future with such comments as:

Need to organise things differently in future, We have looked into extra resources, This has raised my awareness.

Some of the lecturers identified areas where the department was responding, as evidenced by the following comments:

We have responded as a Department to different timetable arrangements as requested by students and the timetable is now given to students and we keep them posted as to what is happening in advance

Others stated that they had passed the information onto the department through programmes co-ordinators or to Heads of Department by comments such as:

I have passed the information on and there has been some change OR just passed onto the Department or Information passed to course coordinator.

However, twenty eight percent of lecturers felt they had no feedback from departments and therefore did not know what had happened to the information. They indicated this by the following comments:

passed information onto Department but not heard back yet, I am not sure what happens when I pass the information on I do not think the powers that be actually take enough notice of it. You pass the information on but there is not feedback from departmental heads and faculty heads to address what the students have said or suggested.

Another ten percent of lecturers identified issues which they perceived as not being able to be changed by the department or the institution, for instance:

Some of the stuff the students came up with - for example longer holidays and lunch hours can't be changed. In these cases, I don't think the SGID will have much effect on the department.

Therefore, in the perceptions of students, the department issues which changed were those issues which were capable of resolution at that level, given their motivation. For

example, more tutoring required in lab sessions. This is in contrast to issues such as resources sessions at the end of the day cannot be changed mid-course or those issues such as the provision of access to computing equipment which can only really be resolved at a superordinate level in the institution - be it Dean, Faculty committees, Institution council or even the Government. These levels set the limits and fix the conditions for departments.

Such limits and conditions Dahllof (1991) refers to as frame factors. These are factors which are the conditions which decision makers deem necessary and sufficient in order to attain the goals of the programme or course, so the time available, programme structure and resources are combined in a certain way which are considered to be sufficient to satisfy the given objectives. Frame factors fall into different categories (Lundgren, 1977), the obvious ones being - total time available (for course programme), programme structure (reading and teaching time), human resources available (teaching, technical and support), material resources available (library, labs, rooms) and rules of allocation of the resources. Frame factors do not, in themselves, provide direct explanations for processes and outcomes but are helpful in classifying significant aspects of the situation and explain why those activities which require extra space or time than that available cannot be fulfilled (Gustafsson & Lofgren, 1985).

So often the fixed conditions that these frame factors impose result in the department espousing the need for student feedback whereas the reality is the *fixedness* can close ears and eyes, albeit unintentionally because it falls into "the too hard basket". If the student feedback brings to light difficulties which call for a change of frame, for example, a change in time allocation, it is important that the HOD has a detailed awareness of those individuals responsible for the various areas of the overall framework so as to target them and lobby for support.

Institutional Issues and Change

Students perceived the issues associated with the Institution group as *hindering* learning a great deal more than *helping learning* and over one third of all the suggestions were in

this group. This group also recorded the least amount of change with both *hindrances* and *suggestions*. Within this group Institutional services, which mostly concerned the library and cafeteria as well as other support services were perceived as being less responsive than the Institutional environment. Students made such comments as:

cashflow on this side of the campus, a pub, study areas, a student lounge

The Institutional environment comments equally concerned the internal environment (classroom size, seating, heating) and the campus environment (carparking, taps, lawn mowing) and was perceived as being more responsive and recorded higher **change** than the services. This greater change was largely due to change taking place within the internal environment not the campus environment; - interestingly the internal environment is the area directly shared with the lecturers. The comments from the lecturer interviews showed that they took an active part in some of these issues, for instance:

OHP now in better place, we put curtains up to remove the sun's reflection off the board and these were the issues which students identified as having changed. Also change was perceived for those comments relating to heating. As stated earlier, this cannot be attributed to the SGID process as the institution was already working on this issue and improved it, as identified by students who stated change.

The Institutional Services recorded very low change. Lecturer comments reveal that in response to the feedback of the students' comments the library and cafeteria managers sent memos or letters to be read out to the students by the lecturer. The majority of students still recorded **no change** had taken place except in two instances. These two instances were where the cafeteria manager personally went to see the student groups in the classroom and discussed the issues identified in the following statements with them:

Cafeteria food only for Westerners (no Japanese or Korean food). Someone wanted kimchi: and More Asian food in the cafeteria.

With regard to this hindrance and suggestion from this group both were perceived by the majority of students to have changed, even though other classes had made similar

comments about the cafeteria and they recorded **no change**. This may indicate what it takes to alter students' perspectives.

When commenting on Institutional issues in their interviews sixty percent of the lecturers stated that they had passed on the information, for instance:

*passed on information for the Department agenda
passed on information to the Library manager
these are Institutional issues and I don't know what happened to them*

As with the Department issues, lecturers therefore felt that they had personally responded to the student feedback but the institution was not responding to them or the students. This lack of responsiveness is confirmed by the student perceptions of **no change**. This reveals the inertia that is often associated with greater bureaucracy - the lecturer group by having passed on the information felt they had fulfilled their responsibility and it was up to the institution and departments to respond.

These interview statements are confirmed by the large number of Institutional and Departmental issues that lecturers felt they were not able to comment on and therefore recorded as **not applicable** responses. Lecturers responded **not applicable** to half of the Institutional comments and a quarter of all the Department comments; this is probably realistic in the light of the lecturers' spheres of influence and responsibility. Research studies in the evaluation literature on the effectiveness of student feedback reveal that feedback without the support of consultation with a third party is not very effective and this may well be a major factor in the lack of responsiveness of the Institution and, to a lesser extent, the Department.

Using student feedback effectively to achieve the purpose of improving the quality of educational provision presents several challenges for departments and the institution. These include the establishment of channels, the assigning of responsibility and the passage of time. Channels for getting the information through the system to those persons who have the power to make changes and for those channels to be two way so those persons at the source of the evaluation - lecturers and students - receive feedback have to be established. As responsibility for the quality of facilities and services and the

environment is devolved by the institution to the various academic and service departments the influence of frame factors has to be acknowledged and ways of managing the limits they impose have to be established to ensure that the students criteria of quality are integrated into the conditions under consideration when programmes and courses. Lastly, it must be recognised that given the nature of large institutions time is needed to make changes. Whilst this is recognised, it must also be accepted that a response can be made in the form of a communication with students acknowledging receipt of the issues and this can be actioned rapidly and may contribute to the satisfaction level of students in that they feel they are being listened to and their feedback taken seriously.

However, it is a mistake to assume that even if the communication channels are set up this will translate into commitment; this depends on the orientation towards change of the respondents. People's orientation is coloured by their perceptions of the likely impact of the evaluation on their interests and if there is a high level of recognition of the value of student evaluation, and it is integrated into the management processes which govern the institutional services and environment, then the orientation towards change will be positive. However, orientation towards change is only half of the micro political picture (Aspinwall et al, 1992) as it also depends on the power available; power being the ability to influence people and situations. If the role of evaluation is perceived to contribute towards realistic and optimal balance between different frame factors then an evaluation, even if at present it has no more than an informative and diagnostic value of a summative kind, may fulfil a formative function over a longer time if it contributes to subsequent changes of formal resources and other framework factors which are better equipped and which promote ultimately the goals of the programme (Scriven 1967).

Evaluation demands interpretation and open discussion within the organisation. An approach which makes improvement proceed from feedback has several essential elements: turning data into information and making such information widely available rather than just possessed by a few; providing a forum for asking the important questions about what we want and need to know; valuing strategies of inquiry which can challenge

existing comfortable assumptions and establishing a habit of shared and open learning required in a public commitment to action in the light of the insights that have been gained. These elements are also contained in the SGID evaluation process and add up to a considerable force for improvement.

The ‘Goodness of Quality’ of the Research

Having discussed the various issues identified by this study and looked at the change brought about by the SGID process as monitored by the post SGID follow-up, we now need to consider the *goodness of quality* of the data.

There are a number of ways of looking at the *goodness of quality* of an evaluative method and its data depending on the particular approach of the technique. In this present study, which considers the effectiveness of the SGID process in improving the quality of educational provision, the SGID process combines qualitative and quantitative forms of evaluative evidence. This is because both the SGID process and the evaluation undertaken to identify the quality issues, and therefore the effectiveness of the SGID process, are qualitative processes. As such, issues of ‘validity’ are dealt with in terms of Guba & Lincoln’s (1989) criteria of trustworthiness and authenticity. As a result, because both are hermeneutic, dialectic processes, both have a very high level of goodness or quality of data and outcomes (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The other evaluation method used in this study, that used for the evaluation of change, is a quantitative technique to which the traditional concepts of validity, reliability and generalisability, can be more appropriately applied.

Qualitative Evidence and the Authenticity Criteria.

In terms of the qualitative evaluation method used to elicit the quality issues as perceived by students, the *goodness of quality* of the data will be addressed using the authenticity criteria of Guba & Lincoln (1989).

There have been a number of criticisms of the validity and reliability of data that is generated from processes like SGID. These have centred around concerns of: group dynamics - are *quiet* students comments neglected? is the process high-jacked by students with a particular *barrow*? is the data obtained representative; subjectivity - the comments are not neutral therefore how can the information be valid when it is full of opinion and judgements; and, the method is not rigorous enough.

When one considers the information gathered from the group process, the concerns raised are minimised by having a trained facilitator conduct the SGID who, whilst not directing the flow of comments, ensures that all participants are allowed adequate opportunity for full participation. This ensures fairness as student participate fully in their own constructs. The group process also provides opportunities for students to gain insights into their own reactions to their learning milieu as others raise points they may not have otherwise thought of. This process is what Guba & Lincoln (1989) refer to as ontological authenticity.

Because the process is asking students to identify what helps and hinders their learning, by providing this information it also stimulates students to look critically at their learning environment which in turn engenders improvement in their learning as they gain insights into what they are doing and why. This catalytic authenticity is enhanced by the discussion inherent in the group process. Having come up with a statement, to ensure that there is agreement for it, the facilitator seeks consensus and agreement to ensure that a vocal student is not putting forward a comment without agreement by his peers. Although consensus is sought, it is not mandatory. This ensures that individual strongly held views are included in the SGID, but in this case, the number supporting (or dissenting) from the view is also recorded. Figure 18 sets out the support given to

statements made in the SGID sessions. Support is measured by the ratio of the number of people supporting each statement relative to the total possible number supporting each statement.

Figure 18: Proportion of Students Supporting Statements made in SGIDs

Group	Hindrances	Suggestions
Lecturers	94%	96%
Department	98%	98%
Institution	95%	95%
Students	96%	100%
Total	96%	97%

As can be seen in figure 18, the support given for the statements pertaining to *hindrances* and *suggestions* are 96% and 97%, respectively. The degree of support has also been calculated for each of the groups Lecturers, Department, Institution and Students. This very high level of support, across all groups indicates that a good level of trust can be placed in the fairness of the data. That is, despite allowance being made for individual students to not support comments, the overall student support through negotiation for each comment is high and therefore can be confidently regarded as representative of the perceptions of that particular group of students. Therefore, the data presented here represents the perceptions from 361 students, not that 361 students supported all comments.

The process of involving the students in a group process and allowing them to arrive at their own constructs and negotiate with their co-stakeholders allows the students to explore the issues under discussion and to arrive at a personal understanding of their own stance on the issue thus providing both fairness and ontological authenticity to the process. This negotiation process of group consensus and of retaining a comment with stated support, or deleting it from consideration, also stimulates the process of addressing the issue, thus lending tactical authenticity to the process.

The whole process of arriving at suggestions for the way learning can be improved is similarly authenticated. The students are actively engaged in critically thinking of positive measures that lecturers, themselves or others can take to improve their own learning milieu and this process stimulates and empowers such change; this is catalytic and tactical authenticity.

Having carried out the SGID and recorded all the student comments on to large sheets of paper, the facilitator then transcribes the comments without in any way *tampering* with the data, by editing or interpreting the comments. This is to provide the lecturer with a copy of the comments and thus facilitate the feedback process. The feedback, which takes the form of a peer discussion session, entails both ontological and tactical authenticity as the lecturer gains insights into his/her own actions and thinking as seen from the students perspective, as well as understandings of the student issues and concerns of the department, institution and themselves. These understandings are both of other stakeholder groups and from the viewpoint of the student stakeholder group. The reactions of the lecturer to these comments can be assessed by catalytic authenticity, depending on the degree to which he/she is stimulated to thought and change by the comments. The facilitator may play a *counselling* role at this stage of the process as he/she facilitates the lecturer to look at the comments and arrive at courses of thinking and action to address the various concerns. This helps the lecturer to act on the feedback and provides tactical authenticity to the process.

Following this session of feedback with the facilitator, the lecturer is encouraged to feedback his/her reactions to the process, outlining their intended strategies for change, and addressing those issues which can not be changed and why, and generally informing the students that their evaluation comments have been heard, are appreciated and accepted, and will be acted upon where possible. This process allows the lecturer to give the students feedback on the issues from his/her own perspective, and where appropriate, from the viewpoint of the Department or Institution. This increased understanding of the students from these other stakeholder viewpoints provides educative authenticity to the

process. A similar process occurs when the lecturer provides feedback to the other groups commented on by the students. Unfortunately, there is no framework for this feedback at present within UNITEC, so this part of the process is rather hit-and-miss as it depends on the dedication and will of the lecturer and the recipients involved. Often, the feedback is non-verbal.

As a part of the evaluation process undertaken for this study, an interview with each of the lecturers was undertaken towards the end of the course. This was to assess the fairness of the whole process by eliciting comments from the lecturers on all aspects of the SGID process, their reactions to it, and the change they perceived emanating from it. Thus, the constructions placed by the lecturers - as one of the stakeholders involved - on the process were "solicited and honored".

Finally, turning to the testimony of the participants in the SGID process, that is the assessment of change as measured by the post-SGID follow up. Although this is a quantitative method, largely carried out within an empirical framework, because of the nature of the SGID process itself and the intertwining nature of the fabric of the whole research study, there are elements of a qualitative nature which intrude into this method. Consequently, elements from the authenticity criteria are appropriate in assessing the nature of this data. The assessment of change, as measured by the post-SGID follow up, provides a measure of both the catalytic and tactical authenticity. This is because the questionnaire attempts to assess the degree to which the process has stimulated change, and the degree to which it has actually empowered the relevant party to act.

What is more, it measures this authenticity for two of the major stakeholder groups involved in the process - the students and the lecturers. Comparison of these two perspectives provides illuminating information and educative authenticity. The comparison allows staff perceptions to be put alongside student perceptions and any discrepancies between what staff believe to be the case, and what students indicate that they experience, provides insights into the agreement, or otherwise, of the two stakeholder groups. Not all the comments can be matched, because for some, either the

students or the lecturers regarded the comments as **not applicable**, and the lecturers regarded others as unsuitable or indicated that they were not well placed to comment, for what ever reason.

Agreement was greatest for situations shared by both students and lecturers; that is, the Lecturer group and the Student class dynamics sub-group. There was less agreement with the issues relating to the Department and Institution, mainly because of lecturers stating that the comments were not applicable. For the majority of the Lecturer group comments, both the lecturers and students agreed that there had been change; there were only five comments (8%) where they had different perspectives. For these comments students perceived change had taken place and were satisfied, whilst lecturers did not. With the other comments the lecturer thought they had addressed the issue but students disagreed. With the Student class dynamics subgroup, there was disagreement with four comments (44%) and for all these the lecturers felt that change had taken place whilst students did not. With the Department comments there was a high degree of non-agreement because the lecturers said the comments were **not applicable** whilst the students said there was either **change** or **no change**.

Except for these afore mentioned cases, the student and lecturer perspectives were very similar in the majority of cases. This indicates a commonality of perception between the two stakeholder groups and thus provides educative authenticity.

Quantitative evidence and Validity & Reliability

Further consideration of the *goodness of quality* of the quantitative evidence involves the traditional issues of validity and reliability. Reliability in terms of the comments students indicated were not applicable to comment on, and the validity of retaining or removing such comments from the analysis. There are also questions about the validity of the results when not all the students who participated in the SGID were available to carry out the post SGID follow-up, that is, student attrition. These issues regarding the removal of **not applicable** statements and attrition are addressed in turn.

Firstly, in the Post-SGID follow-up, students were asked to respond to each comment made in the SGID as to whether they perceived change had taken place or not, or whether they believed it was not applicable to comment. Because the focus of the follow up is to assess whether change has taken place or not as a result of the SGID process, those statements which were perceived by a majority of the students to be **not applicable** were removed. Thus, thirteen *hindrance* comments were removed from the study and six *suggestions*, which represent 10% and 5%, respectively of the total comments.

Figure 19 presents the effect of removing these statements; this is done by comparing the change recorded for the complete set of data with that recorded when the **not applicable** statements are removed. This is presented by group and for all *hindrances* and *suggestions*. The full set of data is presented in Appendix C. The data used in the Results section which had the **not applicables** removed can be found in Appendix D, and the removed **not applicable** statements are in Appendix E.

Figure 19: Comparison of Amount of Change Between the Full Set of Data and that Used in this Section with Not Applicables Removed

Group	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	All	Less NA's	All	Less NA's
Lecturer	78%	78%	73%	73%
Department	61%	61%	51%	51%
Institution	32%	31%	29%	29%
Students	69%	71%	58%	61%
Totals	58%	59%	50%	51%

The robustness of the data in terms of reliability is demonstrated by the very small variation in change of one percentage point between the full set of data and that in which the **not applicables** are removed. Even with the student group with a small sample size, there is a difference of only 3% for suggestions.

Secondly, in some cases there were individuals who took part in the SGID who were absent from the post-SGID follow up session; or individuals who were absent for the SGID but present at the Post-SGID; this occurred in six of the eleven classes. Only those students who took part in the original SGID are used. This is enhance the validity of the results by ensuring that no confounding effects are introduced into the monitoring of change by people commenting on statements for which they were not responsible.

Figure 20 records the number of statements made in all the SGIDs and the number made for only those classes where the SGID and post-SGID numbers are the same. The Attrition rate recorded is derived by calculating the sum of the responses for those classes which were dropped because of having fewer students in the follow up, divided by the sum of the possible number of responses. Thus, there is an attrition rate of 57% for Students for *hindrances* because 12 statements are excluded from the total number of Student statements of 21, i.e. $\frac{12}{21} * 100 = 57\%$.

Figure 20: Number of Statements Made in the SGIDs, the Number Made After Attrition is Taken into Account, and the Attrition Rate

	HINDRANCES			SUGGESTIONS		
	Total No.	No. Post-Attrition	Attrition Rate	Total No.	No. Post-Attrition	Attrition Rate
Lecturer	26	19	73%	34	18	53%
Department	32	18	56%	35	23	66%
Institution	39	18	46%	42	18	43%
Students	21	12	57%	5	3	60%
Total	118	67	57%	116	62	53%

There are a number of scenarios which could be present as a result of attrition. Either, the ones who are away all agreed with the initial statement and would have all responded the same way in the post SGID; or, all those away disagreed with the initial statement and therefore would have all scored the question as **not applicable**; or, the ones away would have responded in a statistically similar way to the post-SGID scoring. Because

all class sizes are statistically small, the chances of the latter scenario occurring are only moderate. An example of this probably not happening is in one class where fifteen students participated in the SGID and for the one statement seven did not support it (47%). In the post-SGID only twelve took part but for this statement seven scored it **not applicable** (58%). Were these the same seven? If so, then the **not applicable** can be validly ignored, as the measure of change is only relevant to those who initially agreed with the statement in the SGID.

Because the method used to collect the post-SGID data ensured anonymity for the students, and the nature of the SGID process precludes any record of the names of those agreeing or disagreeing with any statements, there is no way that this conundrum can be addressed absolutely. But this does not invalidate the results; it only illustrates the care with which the quantitative results should be handled and the riders which go with all the outcomes derived from this data. The percentages represent *trends* not *absolutes* and the larger the percentage, and the greater the difference between categories, the more reliable are the outcomes.

To check the reliability of using the follow up results from all eleven cases, those classes with attrition (unequal numbers in the SGID and post-SGID follow up) were dropped from the analysis of change recorded in Figure 21. Thus, figure 21 compares the amount of **change** when those statements affected by attrition are removed from the data, with the amount of **change** for the data presented in the results, i.e. with **not applicables** removed. (Appendix G presents all the comments affected by attrition.) The variation between these two sets of data is within an acceptable range given that six of the eleven classes have been removed because of attrition. The Student *suggestions* is the exception at 61% and 40%, respectively. This results from the small number of statements involved - a total of five with two removed as a result of attrition - which highlights the unreliability of data when very small samples are involved.

Figure 21: Comparison of Amount of Change Between the Set of Data with Not Applicables Removed and that After Attrition is Taken Into Account

Group	HINDRANCES		SUGGESTIONS	
	Less NA's	Attrition	Less NA's	Attrition
Lecturer	78%	85%	73%	72%
Department	61%	54%	51%	48%
Institution	31%	37%	29%	38%
Students	71%	66%	61%	40%
Totals	59%	54%	51%	52%

In summary it can be seen that removing those statements which a majority of students perceived as being **not applicable** has virtually no effect on the overall reliability of the results and likewise that the effects of attrition are within an acceptable range.

Generalisability/Transferability of Results.

Having dealt with the validity and reliability of the quantitative data, the question of generalisability must be addressed. Generalisability is about the degree to which evaluation results can be generalised across time, items and people (Doyle, 1983). It is concerned with whether student evaluations and teacher evaluations, for instance, are consistent. It is concerned with whether evaluation results differ if carried out at a particular time in a course or at a particular time of the day.

In terms of the quantitative analysis, SGID evaluation results are not generalisable by definition. Because the evaluation results are attained by open questioning, because the issues dealt with are those of concern to the participants, because the areas dealt with and the way they are dealt with are not directed, the evaluations are highly subjective. Traditionally, for evaluation data to be generalisable it must have a high degree of interchangeability; therefore the data must have been collected by means of a carefully structured, rigorously tested, questionnaire. But when viewed from the more appropriate authenticity criteria of Guba & Lincoln (1989), the criterion of transferability can be applied, and this is met.

SGID's, being a formative evaluation tool, are about promoting change. Change and awareness in students, and thus an improvement in the learning environment; identification of strengths and weaknesses in teaching practice and provision, and thus change and improvement in teaching practice, methods and delivery; identification and awareness of issues and services pertaining to department, faculty and institution, that through such identification, can be addressed and changed either in fact or perception. SGIDs are not about providing evaluation data upon which assessment of students or teachers are based; they are not about providing data by which teachers emoluments are based or institutions income assessed. SGIDs are about providing students perceptions of issues involving themselves, lecturer content and delivery, and departmental and institutional support and infra-structure. In this way the results are transferable; the *broad brush* concepts and trends are transferable; not the specific, itemised detail.

Cost Effectiveness of the SGID Method.

With respect to evaluations using the SGID process, questions of utility and cost effectiveness must be addressed. Potentially, the process is very expensive. For effective use, trained SGID facilitators must be used, so the cost of this training must be counted. To set up an SGID evaluation, considerable time is involved in *selling* the concept to lecturers/course coordinators and students, coordinating the timing of the SGID and ensuring a trained facilitator is available. Because the collection of student data in the SGID process takes forty five to ninety minutes to carry out, a commitment to the process must be made before an SGID is contracted so time can be allocated and allowed for. There is then the actual cost of tying up a facilitator and a group of students for that time. Post carrying out the data collection, the facilitator is involved in typing up the information and presenting the findings face-to-face to the lecturer/s involved. This *interview* process takes approximately as long as the actual SGID and a cost is incurred in salaries of the participants. The time involved by the respondents in then following up the issues identified also has a cost. Whether this is a cost to the evaluation method or not is a moot point, but it can certainly be argued that issues outside the *sphere of*

influence of the lecturer which the lecturer must pass on to the relevant party or parties is a cost against the method.

To justify this cost, the other side of the balance sheet needs to be evaluated. SGID's being an open ended formative tool provide vital information for change on a broad range of issues, few if any, other evaluation methods cover the gambit of issues. Because evaluation is not limited to the classroom, but rather encompasses **all** aspects of the educational provision as perceived by the student; issues are identified which often would not even be thought of in a closed evaluation method. Not only do the comments elicited through the process provide information by way of their content, but the mere fact of their even having been identified provides valuable insights. Thus, the range of feedback to a broad spectrum of individuals is wide and consequently although the cost is high the pay back is potentially high if acted upon.

The quality of the data is also high. Because the process is a group one facilitated by a trained person, the chance of spurious, off-hand comments being accepted unanimously, or at least unchallenged, is slight. Authenticity of perceptions at the time of the process is therefore high.

As the data gathered from the SGID is presented and discussed with the lecturer, the chances of change are also increased, whilst at the same time providing an informal vehicle for professional development. The advantages of student evaluation and peer support are combined as a trained person (the facilitator) feeds back student evaluations to the lecturer/s. Peer discussion, which is recognised as a valuable professional development strategy, takes place. Subsequent discussion of the issues by the lecturer with the students, then opens up dialogue and provides a healthy two way vehicle for appreciation of different perceptions and subsequent action and change, either in fact or in perception.

This study does not attempt to address the issue of cost effectiveness of SGID's in any formal quantitative way; this is a study of its own. What has been attempted is a

recognition of some of the costs and benefits which tend to indicate that the method is cost effective, used judiciously. SGID's must form a part of the *evaluation kit*, and as with all the tools in the kit, outcomes must be clearly defined so the most suitable tool can be used in any particular instance.

Consideration of Other Factors

Whilst cost has to be taken into account there are other issues to be considered as well which influence the utility of the SGID process. The lecturers in their interviews raised issues of time, the overuse of the method and using other methods as well. The time factor was seen to be an important consideration and many were concerned about this, as shown in the following comments from lecturers:

It may be a problem taking that amount of time out of a course to do a SGID - especially if it's a short course.'

It's time consuming also for the tutors - you've got your briefing, feedback time with the facilitator and then the post discussion with the students.

Facilitators too do them in their own time and voluntarily. You may not be able to return the favour.

Nearly half of the lecturers also questioned the frequency with which any one group of students could be subjected to the method:

I have a worry about how many times a student can go through this process.

It should not be overused - once a semester is enough with any one group.

Respondents were divided as to whether it should be a compulsory requirement to use it. They were not against evaluation being made mandatory but rather that a specific form of data collection be made mandatory. Leaving it for lecturers to decide would seem more consistent with the autonomy expected by academics (Blunden, 1995). Also, nearly half of the lecturers went on to suggest that SGID should not be regarded as a sole means of evaluating courses but be used in tandem with other methods.

With regard to monitoring change, this evaluation design presents a problem in the length of time between the SGID process and the post SGID follow-up, which generally was an interval of between eight and twelve weeks. This may not be enough time for some changes to show. Doyle (1983) argues for considerable patience in the assessment of change because habits developed over two or ten or twenty years are not likely to

change in the few months that encompass this research design. Also, changes that require bureaucratic sanctioning and support may require quite some time to get a response or action. So the encouraging results of the SGID process in terms of the effectiveness in improving the quality of educational provision so far reported may be regarded as conservative, the actual effectiveness of SGID may be even greater than the present data appears to show.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

How effective is the SGID as an evaluation technique to improve the quality of educational provision? Does it provide information about the quality issues of students? Does it make overt the criteria students use to assess the quality of educational provision? Does the feedback from the SGID process bring about improvement in the quality of educational provision? This thesis attempts to throw light on these questions by evaluating the data obtained from a number of SGID processes so as to identify the quality issues perceived by students and by evaluating the improvement in the quality of educational provision defined here as an increased level of change in the students perceptions on those areas identified by students as needing improvement.

The results obtained from this study are a reflection of reality as perceived by students and have the potential to assist both the spread of practices perceived as helpful to learning and improvement in those practices perceived as hindering learning.

The qualitative evaluation approach used to identify the quality issues produced detailed and variable comments. By using a group process a richness in the quality of information is generated that leaves no doubt as to the students' capability and willingness to produce substantive and valuable criteria about the quality of their educational experiences. Therefore, this study supports the view that students must be consulted if educationalists are concerned about improving the quality of educational provision.

The results of this research reveal that an open ended approach like SGID enables the educational providers to understand and capture the students points of view without predetermining those views by prior selection of categories and/or questions. By capturing viewpoints, it can be seen that students take a holistic view and make comments about their total learning milieu - the lecturers, the department, the institution and themselves as learners. This being the case, it is of no small concern that the literature reveals that the majority of student evaluations focus on the teacher and teaching and therefore fail to capture student feedback on the total learning experience of students. This concern is deepened by the results revealing that the usual focus of student evaluations - the teacher - is regarded by this group of students as helping

learning, whereas issues around the department and the institution and the students themselves are seen as hindering learning. Feedback on these areas is not usually sought from students.

It is concluded that it is the open endedness of the SGID focus questions, combined with the use of a group process, which is responsible for generating the *big picture* of the total student experience. This is achieved by affording on the one hand ample opportunity for students to consider what helps and hinders their learning along with constructive suggestions for improvement and, on the other hand, by inviting comments on issues which influence student learning from all areas of educational provision. Dahllof (1991, 149) supports this stance when he states that, "Evaluation will play a key role in encouraging positive development by providing a basis for feedback and improvement. But this will only occur if the present emphasis is changed in favour of the overall context".

The three questions - what helped your learning, what hinders your learning and suggestions for improvement - are important in the context of change as it allows providers to target their strengths and weaknesses and thereby maximise the former and minimise the latter. But, any resulting action must take into account consideration that this categorisation by students is highly contextual at the micro level by being particular to that group of students and at that particular time.

The suggestions made by students which were broadly related to the hindrances were for the most part considered viable by the lecturers. The number of suggestions made, especially for the institution which largely hindered learning, demonstrates the students willingness to supply solutions when given the opportunity, even when they are very satisfied, as they are with the majority of the lecturers issues.

The monitoring of student perceptions in the Post-SGID follow-up as to what change had taken place as a result of the SGID process, revealed that students perceived lecturers as very responsive to their feedback. It can be concluded that the SGID as a

total process contributes to this change by lecturers in that the process encapsulates a large number of the conditions that the evaluation literature suggests promote the effectiveness of student feedback in bringing about improvement. These conditions are: the feedback is from a credible source - the students; the feedback to the lecturer is augmented by a third party - the SGID facilitator; the lecturer is committed to feeding back to the students; the timing of the evaluation is mid-course; and the lecturers and students take an active part in the process. In their interviews lecturers applauded the SGID process for its open endedness, its group process and they felt it was motivating as it stimulated self reflection and threw light on the realm of departmental and institutional issues.

This study shows that, when it comes to determining ownership of the quality issues identified, students do not see themselves as principally responsible for their learning. Instead, they see responsibility lying with the lecturer, the Department and the Institution. In addition, they perceive the issues around themselves as hindering more than helping learning. For educationists this represents a real challenge in the light of the need for students to become more independent as self directed learners. However, there is a glimmer of optimism, in that of those issues they did identify about themselves, albeit the least number of comments, class dynamics was an area which students perceived as changing a great deal. This indicates the potential of the SGID process to empower students to be self regulatory in their learning environment. It can also benefit the learning process itself because the process encourages students to think critically about their learning environment and also stimulates them to consider their involvement in it.

The issues concerning the department hindered slightly more than helped learning. Labs and information technology facilities and services and the management of programmes, were perceived as important issues by students. Interestingly, content, assessment and materials, that is the academic issues, attracted relatively few comments. This was especially so for issues involving assessment. The student focus was mainly on organisational-type issues and these issues were perceived to have changed to a

reasonable extent, although it appears that this resulted to a large degree from direct lecturer action and influence.

The institutional issues of services and environment were seen to be hindering a great deal more than helping learning, especially the service of the library and cafeteria, and responsiveness to change was not very apparent with these issues. The lecturers perceived themselves as passing on the student comments to the department and to the institution, yet they felt there was little feedback to themselves or the students.

Assuming that the espoused value of student feedback is translated into interest and motivation by the department and the institution, then perhaps the lack of responsiveness is due to the fact that these groups have not been the subject of student evaluation in the past, and as result, no communication channels for feedback and reporting have been established or activated. This involves not only getting the information through to where it belongs, but also communicating back to the relevant source - in this case the students - once the action, or at the very least a response, has taken place.

A further limiting factor in terms of responsiveness could be the frame factors described by Dahllof (1991), that is, those factors controlled from the superordinate levels - be they Head of Department, Dean, Institution Council or the Government which limits the human and technical resources and time allocations.

To stimulate and enable the department and the institution to be more responsive to student feedback, it is concluded that those conditions which engage the respondents to receive and respond to the feedback need to be identified. Only then can similar appropriate conditions be employed by these groups to respond to the information provided by the SGID process. This may be done by augmenting the student feedback by a third party and involving key people in the process through the establishment of communication channels by which the information from the students can be gained and in turn, fed back.

The SGID process, and the evaluation of the student identified quality issues carried out for this study involved both qualitative and quantitative techniques. The illuminative evaluation processes themselves are hermeneutic, didactic processes and as such have a high degree of authenticity on Guba & Lincoln's (1989) authenticity criteria. The quantitative monitoring of change has a high degree of reliability and also lend itself to Guba & Lincoln's (1989) concepts of credibility and authenticity, by which criteria the goodness of the quality of the evaluation is confirmed.

With respect to the utility and cost effectiveness of the process, it is potentially expensive. Given the special nature of the illuminative process used and the very broad evaluation of all aspects of the learning milieu available, this cost would appear to be justified. This particular aspect of the effectiveness of the process is not really addressed by this study, but it is important that it be addressed by future research.

How should the SGID process be used? It is concluded that the SGID process by no means rules out any other methods. An overall evaluation framework for evaluation and improving quality is likely to require a combination of methods for collecting student feedback and also feedback from a variety of sources including other stakeholders. No single method or source can identify all that is necessary to improve the quality of educational provision. What is needed are simultaneous and parallel evaluations to tap all available kinds of information so advantage can be taken of the different criteria of quality held by different stakeholders. Student evaluations are one strand of the total evaluation process and, albeit that SGID is a highly effective process, it must be supplemented by other methods and sources.

The SGID process is primarily designed for improvement or formative purposes rather than for accountability or summative purposes. But given the responsibilities for their actions that individual educators must assume there are no barriers to its usage to meet the requirements of accountability. However, central to the SGID process is the confidentiality of the facilitator and this must be ensured. The information is owned by the respondents and it is very important that the respondents retain choice over the usage

of the data. This is crucial if the SGID process is to retain its powerful potential as an enabling process to improve the quality of educational provision.

Most of the lecturers who participated in this research expressed the view in their interviews that SGID usage should be optional. Evaluation can be made mandatory without mandating specific forms of data collection and such an approach would seem to be more consistent with the traditions of academic autonomy than is the mandating of a specific technique (Blunden, 1995). The lecturers also cautioned against its over use or its use as the only method. There was a clear consensus in favour of using it in conjunction with other evaluation methods and they cite the time it takes as one factor and student tolerance of the method as another factor militating against its frequent use.

It is not possible to assert that any evaluation study captures perfectly what is sought and here too there are limitations in this evaluation of the effectiveness of SGID that must be acknowledged. This study is based on 'perceptions' of students and to a lesser extent lecturers. The quality issues are those issues perceived by students to have helped or hindered their learning. These perceptions are the data of the SGID process and as such are highly subjective and are particular to a specific group of students, at a specific time in the course, at a specific institution. Change is monitored by gathering students' responses to what they perceive to have changed and these are verified by yet another set of perceptions, those of the lecturers. There are no controlled or measurable checks and balances, there cannot be, for this study is a real life context. Student and lecturer responses are based on the assumption that both parties are sensitive to their learning needs and to change, and that they have the ability to record whether change has taken place or not, or whether the issue is not applicable to them.

The monitoring of change uses an SGID and post SGID design, that is, feedback is obtained in the SGID and the effects of the feedback are monitored by students stating whether there has been change in their perceptions. There are three main limitations with this design: firstly, it is assumed that any change that has occurred is a result of the SGID process when it is impossible to gauge whether some of the changes would have

happened anyway or are the result of other factors. This assumption is based on the knowledge that the SGID process incorporates nearly all the conditions as stated in the evaluation literature that produce effective feedback. Secondly, it is not possible to ascertain if change has resulted from students' knowledge of the issues and thereby reacting to those issues so that their responses are founded on reactive effects rather than changes made by the respondents of the feedback. Thirdly, the length of time between the SGID process and post SGID process follow up may not have provided enough time for some changes to show, especially when dealing with large departments and institutions.

However, limitations notwithstanding, the SGID process is an useful and reliable technique for gathering and using feedback with a view to improving the quality of educational provision.

Implications for Further Research

As so often happens, this study identifies a raft of issues and questions concerning the SGID process. These include issues which can fit loosely under the headings of operational factors, process factors, cost effectiveness, quality assurance and accountability, and issues to do with departments and institutions.

Some of the issues of an operational nature which were not addressed by this research, but which need to be studied to gain a greater insight into the SGID process and its outcomes include the following. What effect, if any, does 'multiple' lecturers on a course have on an SGID? Factors to be looked at here include the breadth and depth of issues identified; the relative effectiveness of feedback and change when multiple lecturers are involved in the process; do lecturers become defensive or is there an enhancing group collegiality effect present? Does the length of a course affect the effectiveness of the SGID process? Is there any difference in the effectiveness of the SGID process when applied to different faculties or courses? How much variability results from different SGID facilitators? Just how rigorous does the training of the

facilitator have to be and what are the important elements which need to be standardised or emphasised in facilitator training?

To better understand the appropriate use and application of the SGID process, there are a number of process factors which require further study. These include a longitudinal study to evaluate the effect of multiple SGID's on both students and lecturers over time. Is the process enhanced, diluted or not affected? Following on from this, is there an optimum number of SGID's which students should not exceed during the course of their study? If a student takes part in two SGID processes in different course over the same period is there an effect - either enhancing or otherwise?

Cost effectiveness is a very important issue with respect to any initiative these days. It is important that attempts be made to assess the cost effectiveness of carrying out an SGID and comparing this with the cost effectiveness of other evaluation methods. This is closely related to the issues pertaining to any evaluation methods in terms of its effectiveness to stakeholders, both internal and external, in measuring quality assurance and accountability. How amenable are the outcomes of the SGID process to measures of accountability and how transferable are the issues identified?

Related to the effectiveness of the process are issues connected with the department and institutions. How does one get wider involvement and commitment by these groups to take on board and respond to students' issues? How do departments, service departments and the institution regard student feedback? Lecturers were interviewed in this study to elicit their perceptions; the same needs to be done in the broader realm of the institution.

Although, as just set out, much research into the SGID process and its effectiveness needs to be carried out, this study clearly shows that the process is an effective means of identifying a number of quality issues as perceived by the students. These issues encompassed the whole learning milieu and it was found that change occurred to issues

for which the feedback was communicated to the relevant person/s. Student evaluations such as SGID are only one strand of the total evaluation process. Whilst it is wise to recognise the complications as well as the virtues of student feedback, the indisputable value of involving students in the maintenance and assurance of quality in higher education must be recognised, sanctioned and acted upon.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, R. D., Wulff, D.H., Nyquist, J.D., Ropp, V.A. & Hess, C.W., 1990 Satisfaction with processes of collecting student opinions about instruction: The student perspective, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 82, 2, 201-206.
- Abrami, P.C., D'Apollonia, S. & Cohen, P.A., 1990 Validity of student ratings of instruction: What we know and what we do not, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 82, 2, 219-231.
- Aitken, G., 1994 **Discussing the Observation**. Notes distributed for staff observation of teacher trainees, Auckland, Auckland College of Education.
- Aleamoni, L.M., 1974 **The Usefulness of Student Evaluations in Improving College Teaching** Research Report No. 356 Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED099317
- Aleamoni, L.M., 1976 Typical faculty concerns about evaluation of instruction. Cited in Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation. **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396.
- Aleamoni, L.M. & Stevens, J.J., 1983 **The Effectiveness of Consultation in Support of Student evaluation Feedback: A Ten Year Follow-Up**. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Albuquerque, NM, Apr 28 - May 1.
- Alkin, M.C., 1969 Evaluation theory development. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Alkin, M.C., 1991 Evaluation theory development. In McLaughlin, M.W. & Phillips, D.C., (eds) **Evaluation and Education: a Quarter Century**, Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.
- Alkin, M.C. & Solman, L.C.,(eds) 1983 The costs of evaluation. Cited in Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R., 1987 **Educational Evaluation - Alternative Approaches & Practical Guidelines**, New York: Longman Inc.
- Anderson, L.W. & Burns, R.B., 1989 **Research in Classrooms: The Study of Teachers, Teaching and Instruction**, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Argyris, C., 1982 **Reasoning, Learning, and Action**, San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

- Aspinwall, K., Simkins, T., Wilkinson, J.F. & McAuley, M.J., 1992 **Managing Evaluation in Education - A Developmental Approach**, London: Routledge.
- Astin, A.W., 1982 Why not try some new ways of measuring quality? Cited in Yorke, M., 1995 Siamese Twins? Performance indicators in the service of accountability and enhancement, **Quality in Higher Education**, Vol 1, No 1, 5- 12 1995.
- Astin, A.W., 1985 **Achieving Educational Excellence**. London, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Baker, W. & Shephard, W., 1995 Unpub, **Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID): An Investigative research into the potential of the SGID method of evaluation in higher education**, Auckland: UNITEC.
- Baldwin, C., 1993 Reviewing quality criteria, **QHE Update**, Nov., 1993, No. 6, 3-4.
- Barnett, R., 1992 **Improving Higher Education - Total Quality Care**, Great Britain: The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Baron, R.A. & Bryne, D., 1987 **Social Psychology: Understanding Human Interaction** (5th ed), Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Batten, M., 1989 Teacher and pupil perspectives on the positive aspects of classroom experience, **Scottish Educational Review**, 21, 1, 48-57.
- Batten, M., 1994 Students' perspective of effective teaching, **SCORE**, Vol. 2, No. 6, 4-5.
- Begum, H.A. & Ahmed, E., 1988 Individual risk-taking and risky shift as a function of cooperation-competition proneness of subjects. Cited in Townsend, M. A. R., & D. W. Moore 1994 Co-operative Group versus Individual Evaluations of Instruction in Professional In-Service Training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Bennett, W.E., 1987 **Post-Tenure Instructional Assessment: A procedure that helps mature faculty maintain and increase instructional effectiveness**, paper given at the A.A.J.C. Convention, 1988.
- Bergquist, W.H. & Phillipps, S.R., 1977 A Handbook of faculty development, Vol. II Washington DC. Cited in Wulff, D.H., Staton-Spicer, A.Q., Hess, C.W. & Nyquist, J., The student perspective on evaluating teaching effectiveness, **Association for Communication Administration Bulletin**, No.53, August, 1985.

- Biggs, J.B., 1990 Teaching: Design for learning. In Ramsden, P., 1990, **Evaluating teaching; supporting learning**. Keynote paper at the Annual Conference of Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Griffith University , 6-9 July 1990.
- Bloom, S.B., Hastings, J.T. & Madaus, G.F., 1971 **Handbook of Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning**, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Blunden, R., 1995 The practicum in teacher education: subject evaluation and moral responsibility, **Evaluation Journal of Australasia** , Vol .7, No.1, 24-43.
- Bogue, E.G. & Saunders, R.L., 1992 **The Evidence for Quality**, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Bonoma, T.V., 1977 Overcoming resistance to changes recommended for operating programs, **Professional Psychology**, 8, 451-463.
- Braden, R.A., 1987 Instructional design, 1986: Forms of formative evaluation, **Educational Technology**, January, 33-34.
- Braskamp, L.A., 1984 **Guidelines for Using Rating Scales and Checklists**, Phi Delta Kappa: Centre on Evaluation, Development & Research.
- Braunstein, D.N., Klein, G.A., & Pachla, M., 1973 Feedback expectancy shifts in student ratings of college faculty, **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 58, 254-258.
- Bryan, R.C., 1963 Reactions to teachers by students, parents, and administrators. United States office of education. Cited in Tuckman, B.W. & Oliver, W.K., 1967 Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source, **Journal of Educational Psychology** Vol. 38, No 4, 297-301.
- Carter, K.R., 1974 The effect of student feedback in modifying teaching performance, **Dissertation Abstract International**, 35, 5110A.
- Centra, J.A., 1973 The effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 65, 395-401.
- Centra, J.A., 1982 **Determining Faculty Effectiveness**, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Clark, D.L., 1987 High school seniors react to their teachers and their schools, **Phi Delta Kappan**, March, 503-509.

- Clark, D.J. & Bekey, J., 1979 Use of small groups in instructional evaluation. Cited in Wulff, D.H., Staton-Spicer, A.Q., Hess, C.W. & Nyquist, J., The student perspective on evaluating teaching effectiveness, **Association for Communication Administration Bulletin**, No.53, 1985.
- Clark, D.J. & Redmond, M.V., 1981 **Small Group Instructional Diagnosis: A Final Report**, Seattle: University of Washington.
- Cohen, P. A., 1981 Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multi-section validity studies, **Review of Educational Research**, 51, 281-309.
- Cohen, P.A. & Herr, G., 1982 Using an interactive feedback procedure to improve college teaching, **Teaching Psychology**, 9, 3, 138-140.
- Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T., 1979 **Quasi Experimentation: Design & Analysis for Field Settings**, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cooley, W.W. & Bickel, W.E., 1986 Decision-oriented educational research. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Costin, F., Greenough, W.T. & Menges P.J., 1971 Student rating of college teaching: Reliability, validity and usefulness. Cited in Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation, **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396.
- Cronbach, L.J., 1963 Course improvement through evaluation, **Teachers College Record**. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Cronbach, L.J., Ambron, S.R., Dornbusch, S.M., Hess, R.D., Hornick, R.C., Phillips, D.C., Walker, D.E., & Weiner, S.S., 1980 Toward reform of program evaluation. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Cronbach, L.J., 1982 Designing evaluation of educational and social programmes. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Cruse, D. B., 1987 Student evaluations and the university professor: Caveat professor, **Higher Education**, 16, 723-737.

- Dahllof, U., 1991 Practice and evidence in the evaluation of teaching. In Dahllof, D., Harris, J., Shattock, M., Staropoli, A. & in't Veld, R., **Dimensions of Evaluation -Report of the IMHE Study Group on Evaluation in Higher Education**, Higher Education Policy Series ,13, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Darling-Hammond, L, Wise, A.E. & Pease, S.R., 1983 Teacher evaluation in the organisational context: A review of the literature, **Review of Educational Research**, Fall, Vol. 53, No. 3, 285-328.
- Dochy, F.J.R.C., Segers, M.S.R. & Wijnen, W.H.F.W., 1990 Preliminaries to the implementation of a quality assurance system based on management information and performance indicators. In Dochy, F.J.R.C., Segers, M.S.R., Wijnen, W.H.F.W., (eds), **Management Information and Performance Indicators in Higher Education: An International Issue**. Cited in Harvey, L., Burrows, A. & Green, D., 1992 **Criteria of Quality**, Birmingham: QHE., University of Central England.
- Dornbusch, S.M. & Scott, W.R. 1975 Evaluation and the exercise of authority. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon
- Doyle, K.O., 1983 **Evaluating Teaching**, USA: Lexington Books.
- Doyle, K.O. & Whitely, S.E., 1974 Student ratings as criteria for effective teaching, **American Educational Research Journal**, 11, 3, 259-274.
- Dunkin, M.J. & Barnes, J., 1986 Research on teaching in higher education. Cited in Wittrock, M.C., (ed) 986 **Handbook of Research on Teaching**. Third edit. New York: MacMillan
- Eaton, M. & Pougiales, R., 1993 Work, reflection, and community: Conditions that support writing self evaluations, **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**, No.56, 47-63.
- Elton, L. & Partington, P., 1991 Teaching standards and excellence in higher education: development and culture for quality, **Occasional Green Paper**, No.1 October, UK: CVCP University House.
- Erickson, G.R. & Erickson, B.L., 1979 Improving College Teaching: An evaluation of a teaching consultation procedure, **Journal of Higher Education**, 50, 670-683.
- Friedlander, J., 1978 Student perceptions on the effectiveness of mid-term feedback to modify college instruction, **Journal of Educational Research**, 71, 140-143.

- Fulmer, W. & Fulmer, R., 1990 Strategic group technique: Involving managers in strategic planning, **Long Range Planning**, Vol.23, No.2, 79-84.
- Gage, N.L., Runkel, P.J. & Chatterjee, B.B., 1960 Equilibrium theory and behaviour change: An experiment in feedback from pupils to teachers. Cited in Tuckman, B.W. & Oliver, W.K., 1967 Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source, **Journal of Educational Psychology** Vol. 38, No 4, 297-301.
- Gage, N.L., Runkel, P.J. & Chatterjee, B.B., 1963 Changing teacher behaviour through feedback from pupils: An application of equilibrium theory. Cited in Charters, W.W. & Gage, N.L., (eds) **Readings in Social Psychology of Education**, Boston, Allyn & Bacon.
- Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation, **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396.
- Gibbs, G. & Habeshaw, S., 1989 **53 Interesting ways to appraise your teaching**, UK: Technical and Educational Services Ltd.
- Gold, Y. & Roth, R.A., 1993 **Teachers Managing Stress and Preventing Burnout**, London: The Falmer Press
- Grush, J.E. & Costin, F., 1975 The student as the consumers of the teaching process. Cited in Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation, **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S., 1989 **Fourth Generation Evaluation**, California, Sage.
- Gustafsson, C., 1988 Performance Indicators. Cited in Dahllof, U., 1991 Practice and Evidence in the Evaluation of Teaching. In Dahllof, D., Harris, J., Shattock, M., Staropoli, A. & in't Veld, R., **Dimensions of Evaluation -Report of the IMHE Study Group on Evaluation in Higher Education**, Higher Education Policy Series ,13, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Gustafsson, C. & Lofgren, J., 1985 Samverkan mellan gymnasieskola och kommunal vuxenutbildning. Cited in Dahllof, U., 1991 Towards a new model for evaluation of teaching: An interactive process-centred approach. In Dahllof, D., Harris, J., Shattock, M., Staropoli, A. & in't Veld, R., **Dimensions of Evaluation -Report of the IMHE Study Group on Evaluation in Higher Education**, Higher Education Policy Series , 13, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Haller, E.J. & Strike, K.A., (eds) 1986 **An Introduction to Educational Administration: Social, Legal and Ethical Perspectives**, New York: Longman.

- Harvey, L., 1993a Continuous quality improvement: A system-wide view of quality in higher education. Draft Oct. 1993 for Knight P (Ed) 1994, **System-wide curriculum change**, Great Britain: SEDA/OU Press.
- Harvey, L., (Ed) 1993b **Quality assessment in higher education: collected papers of the QHE project**, Birmingham: QHE.
- Harvey, L., (Ed) 1993c Total student experience **QHE Update**, May Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project, Birmingham: QHE.
- Harvey, L., (Ed) 1993d Total student experience of learning, **QHE Update**, June Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project, Birmingham: QHE.
- Harvey, L., (Ed) 1993e Quality measures as an element of corporate strategy, **QHE Update**, Nov. Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project, Birmingham: QHE.
- ✓ Harvey, L., Burrows, A. & Green, D., 1992 **Criteria of Quality**, Birmingham: QHE., University of Central England.
- ✓ Harvey, L. & Green, D., 1993 Defining Quality, **Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education**, 18, No.1.
- Hendershott, A. & Wright, S., 1993 Student focus groups and curriculum review, **Teaching Sociology**, Vol.21, No.2, 154-59.
- Hill, R., 1995 A European Student Perspective on Quality, **Quality in Higher Education**, Vol. 1, No. 1, 67-76.
- Kaufman, R. & Zahn, D., 1993 **Quality Management Plus - The Continuous Improvement of Education**, California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Kulik, J.A., 1977 Teaching in higher education, student reactions to instructions. Cited in Talbot, R.W., 1992 Directed small group discussions as an evaluation method for improving performance in post-secondary education, **Higher Education Management**, Vol.4, No.3, pp.346-357.
- Lamm, H. & Myers, D.G., 1978 Group induced polarisation of attitudes and behaviour. Cited in Townsend, M. A. R., & Moore, D. W., 1994 Co-operative group versus individual evaluations of instruction in professional in-service training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G., 1986 But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In Williams, D.D.,(ed) **Naturalistic Evaluation**, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lundgren, U.P., 1977 Model analysis of pedagogical processes. Cited in Dahllof, U., 1991 Towards a new model for evaluation of teaching: An interactive process-centred approach. In Dahllof, D., Harris, J., Shattock, M., Staropoli, A. & in't Veld, R., Dimensions of Evaluation -Report of the IMHE Study Group on Evaluation in Higher Education, **Higher Education Policy Series**, 13, London, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- McKeachie, W.J., Lin, Y.G., Daugherty, M., Moffett, M.M., Neigler, C., Nork, J., Walz, M. & Baldwin, R., 1980 Using Student ratings and Consultation to Improve Instruction, **British Journal of Educational Psychology**, 50, 168-174.
- McLaughlin, M.W. & Pfeifer, R.S., 1988 **Teacher Evaluation - Improvement, Accountability and Effective Learning**, New York: Teachers College Press.
- Maier, N.R.F. & Hoffman, L.R., 1964 Quality of first and second solutions in group problem solving, **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 31, 310-323.
- Manatt, R.P., 1988 Teacher performance evaluation; A total systems approach. In Stanley, S.J. & Popham, W.J., (eds), **Teacher Evaluation; Six Prescriptions for Success**, 79-108, Association for Supervision and Development.
- Manthei, M., unpub **Improving the quality of teaching and learning through one staff development method**, Christchurch: MS Christchurch Polytechnic.
- Marsh, H.W., 1984 Students' evaluation of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and utility, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, Vol. 76, No.5, 707-754.
- Menges, R.J., 1984 Evaluation in the service of faculty. In Seldin, P., **Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation**, Jossey Bass Higher Education Series.
- Miles, P.L., 1989 **A Communication Based Strategy to Improve Teaching: The Continuous Feedback Technique**, Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Assoc., San Francisco, November, 1989.
- Miller, M.T., 1971 Instructor attitudes towards and their use of student ratings of teachers, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 62, 235-239.
- Moodie, G.C., 1986 Fitness for What? In Moodie, G.C., (ed), Standards and Criteria in Higher Education. Cited in Harvey, L., Burrows, A. & Green, D., 1992 **Criteria of Quality**, Birmingham: QHE., University of Central England

- Morgan, D.L., 1988 Focus groups as qualitative research. Cited in Hendershott, A. & Wright, S., 1993 Student focus groups and curriculum review, **Teaching Sociology**, Vol.21, No.2, 154-59.
- Morgan, G., 1983 **Beyond Method**, California: Sage.
- Moscovici, S. & Zavalloni, M., 1969 The group as a polarizer of attitudes. Cited in Townsend, M. A. R. & Moore, D. W., 1994 Co-operative group versus individual evaluations of instruction in professional in-service training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Myers, D.G. & Lamm, H., 1976 The group polarisation phenomenon. Cited in Townsend, M. A. R., & Moore, D. W., 1994 Co-operative group versus individual evaluations of instruction in professional in-service training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Nadeau, R., 1993 Criteria and indicators of quality and excellence for colleges and universities in Canada: Report on a National Delphi Study. Cited in Harvey, L., 1993 Continuous quality improvement: A system-wide view of quality in higher education. Draft Oct. 1993 for Knight P (Ed) (1994) **System-Wide Curriculum Change**, Great Britain: SEDA/OU Press.
- Nevo, D., 1986 Conceptualization of educational; evaluation: an analytical review of the literature. In House, E.R. (ed) **New Directions in Educational Evaluation**, London: The Falmer Press
- Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Newby, T., Sherman, M. & Coffman, S.J., 1991 **Instructional Diagnosis: Effective open-ended faculty evaluation**, Paper at American Educational Research Association meeting, Chicago, April, 1991
- Nyquist, J., 1992 **SGID workshop notes**, Auckland University, July 1 1992
- O'Connor, B. & Codling, A. 1994 How to Pull Yourself up by Your Own Bootstraps. Faculty Review as a Method of Implementing Quality Assurance, **Journal of Institutional Research in Australasia**, Vol.3, No.1.
- Ory, J.C., Braskamp, L.A. & Pieper, D.M., 1980 Congruence of student evaluative information: Collected by three methods, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 72, 2, 181-185.
- Overall, J.U. & Marsh, H.W., 1979 Midterm Feedback from Students: Its Relationship to Instructional Improvement & Students Cognitive & Reflective Outcomes, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 71, 6, 856-865.

- Overall, J.U. & Marsh, H.W., 1980 Students' evaluation of instruction: A longitudinal study of their stability, **Journal of Educational Psychology**, Vol 72, No.3, 321-325.
- Page, C. F., 1974 **Student Evaluation of Teaching: The American Experience**, London: Research in Higher Education Monographs.
- Pambookian, H.S., 1972 The effect of feedback from students to college instructors on their teaching behaviour, **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 33, 4950A.
- Parlett, M. & Hamilton, D., 1972 Evaluation as Illumination: a new approach to the study of innovatory programmes, **Occasional Paper 9**, Centre for Research in the Educational Sciences, University of Edinburgh.
- Patton, M.Q., 1980, **Qualitative Evaluation Methods**, California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Perry, R.P., Abrami, P.C. & Leventhal, I., 1979 Educational seduction: The effect of instructor expressiveness and lecture content on student rating and achievement. Cited in Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation, **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396.
- QHE, Update 1993, May **The Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project**, No.7
- QHE, Update 1993, June **The Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project**, No.5.
- QHE, Update 1993, November **The Newsletter of the Quality in Higher Education Project**, No.6.
- Ramsden, P., 1990 **Evaluating Teaching; Supporting Learning**. Keynote paper at the Annual Conference of Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Griffith University , 6-9 July 1990.
- Ramsden, P., 1991 A performance indicator of teaching quality in higher education: the course experience questionnaire, **Studies in Higher Education**, 16, 129-150.
- Ramsden, P. & Dodds, A., 1989 **Improving Teaching and Courses: A Guide to Evaluation**, University of Melbourne: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.

- Ramsey, R.S., 1980 The effect of evaluative feedback from students on faculty performance at the University of Mississippi, **Dissertation Abstract, International**, 41, 4622A.
- Redmond, M.V., 1982 A process of midterm evaluation incorporating small group discussion of a course and its effects on student motivation, **FIPSE Report**, Washington DC.
- Rotem, A. & Glasman, M.S., 1979 On the effectiveness of students' evaluative feedback to university instructors, **Review of Educational Research**, Vol.49, No.3, 497-511.
- Rowntree, D., 1974 **Educational Teaching in Curriculum Development**, London: Harper & Row.
- Scallon, G., 1988 L'evaluaion formative des apprentissages. In Talbot, R.W., 1992 Directed Small Group Discussions as an Evaluation Method for Improving Performance in Post-Secondary Education, **Higher Education Management**, Vol.4, No.3, 346-357.
- Schon, D.A., 1983 **The Reflective Practitioner - How Professionals Think in Action**. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Scriven, M., 1967 The methodology of evaluation. In Stake, R.E., (ed), AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon..
- Scriven, M., 1990 Can research-based teacher evaluation be saved? In Swab, R., (ed) **Research-Based Teacher Evaluation**, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Scriven, M., 1991 Beyond formative and summative evaluation. In McLaughlin, M.W. & Phillips, D.C., (eds) **Evaluation and Education: at Quarter Century**, Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.
- Seldon, P., 1989 Using Student Feedback to Improve Teaching, **New Directions for Teaching and Learning**, No.37, 89-97.
- Siagan, E., 1983 The impact of student evaluative feedback on the perceptions of the teaching faculty at Andrews University, **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 44, 1254A.
- Smith, D.L., 1977 The relationship of feedback to professors of the results of student ratings of their teaching effectiveness at mid-semester to their end-of-semester ratings, **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 38, 187A.

- Smith, T., Sheffield, J. & Whitworth, B., unpub report **The Effect of Electronic Meeting Technology on the Style of Decision Making in Meetings**, Auckland: Carrington Polytechnic.
- Smith, W.G., 1975 The influence of student feedback on changing teaching behaviour of college faculty members, **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 36, 4424A.
- Spencer, P.A. & Flyr, M. 1992 The Formal Evaluation as an Impetus to Classroom Change: Myth or Reality? ERIC ED 349053.
- Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G., Hammond, R.L., Merriman, H.O. & Provus, M.M., 1971 Educational evaluation and decision making. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Suchman, E.A., 1967 Evaluative research: principles on practice in public service and social action programmes. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Talbot, R.W., 1992 Directed small group discussions as an evaluation method for improving performance in post-secondary education, **Higher Education Management**, Vol.4, No.3, 346-357.
- Tiberius, R.G., Sackin, H.D. & Cappe, L., 1987 A comparison of two teaching methods of evaluating teaching, **Studies in Higher Education**, 12, 3, 287-297.
- Thorndike, R.L. & Hagen, E., 1986 Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon.
- Tjosvold, D. & Field, R.H.G., 1982 Effect of concurrence, controversy, and consensus on group decision making, Cited in Townsend, M. A. R., & Moore, D. W., 1994 Co-operative group versus individual evaluations of instruction in professional in-service training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Townsend, M. A. R., & Moore, D. W., 1994 Co-operative group versus individual evaluations of instruction in professional in-service training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Tuckman, B.W. & Oliver, W.K., 1967 Effectiveness of feedback to teachers as a function of source, **Journal of Educational Psychology** Vol. 38, No 4, 297-301.

- Tuckman, B.W. & Yates, D., 1980 Evaluating the student feedback strategy of changing teacher style, **Journal of Educational Research**, 74, 2, 74-77.
- Turner, J.C., Wetherall, M.S. & Hogg, M.A., 1989 Referent informational influence and group polarisation. Cited in Townsend, M. A. R., & D. W. Moore 1994 Co-operative Group versus Individual Evaluations of Instruction in Professional In-Service Training, **Australian Journal of Education**, Vol 38, No 2, 139-147.
- Tyler, R. W., 1950 Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Cited in Nevo, D., 1995 **School-Based Evaluation - A Dialogue for School Improvement**, Gt. Britain: Pergamon..
- Vroeijenstijn, A.I., 1991 External quality assessment: servant of two masters? Paper presented at a conference on quality assurance in higher education in Hong Kong on July 15-17 1991. Cited in Harvey, L., Burrows, A., & Green, D., 1992, **Criteria of Quality**, Britain, Hobbs Ltd.
- Walden, J.W.H., 1909 Universities of ancient Greece. Cited in Doyle, K.O., 1983 **Evaluating Teaching**, USA: Lexington Books.
- Ward, V., Bertrand, J. & Brown, L.F., 1991 The comparative of focus groups and survey results. In Hendershott, A. & Wright, S., 1993 Student focus groups and curriculum review, **Teaching Sociology**, Vol.21, No.2, 154-59.
- Ware, J.E. & William, R.G., 1977 Discriminate analysis of student ratings as a means of identifying lecturers who differ in enthusiasm or information giving. Cited in Geva-May, I., 1993 Do student questionnaire responses reflect actual active behaviour. A study in institutional evaluation, **Studies in Educational Evaluation**, Vol. 19, 383-396.
- Wilson, R.C., 1986 Improving faculty teaching: Effective use of student evaluations and consultants, **Journal of Higher Education**, Vol.57, No.2, 196-211.
- Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R., 1987 **Educational Evaluation - Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines**, New York: Longman Inc.
- Wragg, E.C. & Wood, E.K., 1984 Pupil appraisal of teaching. In Wragg, E.C., (ed) **Classroom Teaching Skills**, Beckenham: Croom Helm.
- Wulff, D.H., Staton-Spicer, A.Q., Hess, C.W. & Nyquist, J.D., 1985 The student perspective on teaching effectiveness, **Association for Communication Administration Bulletin**, No.53, August 1985.

- Wunsch, M.A., (Ed) 1993 Exchanging perspectives: A colloquy on teaching in the UK, **The Dept Advisor**, Winter, Vol. 8, No.2.
- Yorke, M., 1995 Siamese Twins? Performance indicators in the service of accountability and enhancement, **Quality in Higher Education**, Vol 1, No 1, 5- 12 1995.

Appendices

Appendix A

A STEP-BY-STEP PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS - SGID

A STEP-BY-STEP PROCEDURE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS - SGID

STEP 1 The Initial Briefing

- ☛ Course tutor & evaluator meet to discuss the process and any issues/concerns the tutor has regarding the class. The tutor may suggest areas she/he wants feedback on.
- ☛ The following are scheduled:
 - a) SGID evaluation time, day & place,
 - b) brief introduction of evaluator **prior** to SGID day,
 - c) a feedback session by evaluator to tutor.



STEP 2 The SGID Student Evaluation Session (45-60 minutes, depending on size of class)

- ☛ Tutor hands over to evaluator and leaves.
- ☛ Evaluator establishes the following:
 - a) process is voluntary
 - b) process is confidential
 - c) process is anonymous
 - d) what information is used for
 - e) that there are no guarantees that all of the changes you would like to see in the class can or will be made, but feedback will be used as a guide.
- ☛ Class is divided into groups of 4 or 5. Each group receives large paper & pens.
- ☛ The SGID process is described to class. Any minority views are to be jotted privately on separate paper. Alert students to consider what impacts on their learning in the broadest sense, eg think about content, teaching methods, the environment, themselves, each other, the available resources.
- ☛ Groups discuss first question (5-10 mins) *What helps your learning in this class?*
- ☛ The sheets from each group are placed on board for general viewing & discussion. Evaluator collates data with all the class by getting agreement, seeking clarifications. If unsure of agreement use a show of hands and record numbers.
- ☛ The same procedure is followed for the other two questions:
What hinders your learning in this class?
What suggestions do you have for improving your learning?



STEP 3 Writing Up Evaluation Information

- ☛ Master list of raw student data taken away by SGID facilitator.
- ☛ Collate responses from students large sheets. Make sure it is a direct transcription of what the students agreed they wanted put forward.
- ☛ Type up ready for Step 4. Remember, this material is confidential so keep in a safe place.
- ☛ Destroy students original.



STEP 4 Feedback with Tutor (this should take place as soon as possible after the student session)

- ☛ Evaluator gives a brief account of what happened during the class session.
- ☛ A written collation of responses is given to tutor.
- ☛ Comments are discussed to ensure a correct interpretation.
- ☛ Facilitator to master confidence of lecturer.
- ☛ Comments are analysed as to:
 - a) what can be changed,
 - b) what is beyond tutors' control to change,
 - c) how things could be changed,
 - d) find & discuss ways the tutor can feedback to students.



STEP 5 Going Back Into the Classroom (this should take place as soon as possible after meeting with facilitator)

- ☛ Tutor thanks students for the feedback.
- ☛ Explain what you are able and going to change but also important to establish what the students are responsible for.
- ☛ Tutor can check student satisfaction in certain areas on the next SGID.
- ☛ Don't open things up for discussion when lecturer feeds back to students as requests for elaboration can erode anonymity.

Appendix B

Letters & Information Sent to Staff & Students at UNITEC

Appendix B-1: Letters to lecturers inviting them to participate in the research project.

Appendix B-2: Letter to SGID facilitators inviting them to participate in the research project.

Appendix B-3: Letter to students.

Appendix B-4: Student consent forms.

Appendix B-5: Briefing letter to lecturers about interview.

Appendix B-6: SGID interview questionnaire.

Academic Development Unit
UNITEC

Dear Lecturer

We are staff development tutors from the Academic Development Unit and we are writing to invite you to assist us in a research project that we are undertaking this year at UNITEC.

The research project aims to investigate the potential of the SGID method of evaluation. There are two parts to this study.

- 1) to identify from the SGID evaluations what students see as 'quality issues.'
- 2) to gauge on the basis of lecturer perceptions, the overall effectiveness of the SGID method of evaluating courses.

If you are agreeable to taking part in this project then we require the following commitment from you.

- permission for an independent SGID evaluator to carry out an SGID evaluation on ONE of your classes.
- permission for us, the research coordinators, to scrutinise the typed-up transcripts of the SGID findings from your classes.
- a meeting with the research coordinators, in which our perceptions about quality issues and the effectiveness of the SGID method are checked against your own.

All in all, this should involve no more than 5 -6 hours of your time.

On our part, we give an assurance that

- permission from students to view the typed-up transcripts will be sought at all times.

- raw student data will not be viewed by us.
- The typed-up transcripts will preserve student anonymity and confidentiality and will be stored in a safe place. They will not be passed on to any unauthorised person.

If you are willing to contribute to this project or, if you require further information, please ring us on the following extensions during office hours or at our home numbers before February 18.

Warren Shephard ext 8344
849 4152 (home)

Wendy Baker ext 8344
818 4708 (home)

We thank you for your co-operation and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Warren Shephard
Wendy Baker
Research Coordinators

Academic Development Unit
UNITEC

Dear

We are staff development tutors from the Academic Development Unit and we are writing to seek your assistance in a research project that we are undertaking this year at UNITEC.

The research project aims to investigate the potential of the SGID method of evaluation. There are two parts to this study.

- 1) to identify from the SGID evaluations what students see as quality issues.'
- 2) to gauge on the basis of lecturer perceptions the overall effectiveness of the SGID method of evaluating courses.

As someone who is interested in the SGID approach and has undertaken facilitator training in the method with us, we would value your participation in the project.

What we are seeking from you is your willingness to carry out 2 full SGID evaluations during the course of the year. These evaluations may occur in faculties/departments different to the one in which you work and will occur sometime between March and August at a time that would obviously be convenient to you. All up, this should involve no more than 6-8 hours of your time.

A similar letter to this has gone out to course lecturers inviting them to take part in the project by having a trained facilitator carry out a SGID evaluation on one of their classes. A letter will also be given to the students immediately prior to the evaluation taking place, informing them of the research project and seeking consent from them for us, the research coordinators to sight the typed-up transcript from their particular class.

If you are willing to contribute to this project by facilitating two SGIDs for us or, if you require further information, please ring us on the following extensions during office hours or at our home numbers before February 18.

Warren Shephard ext 8344
849 4152 (home)

Wendy Baker ext 8344
818 4708 (home)

We thank you for your co-operation and look forward to hearing from you.

Academic Development Unit
UNITEC

Dear Students

We are staff development tutors from the Academic Development Unit and we are writing to seek your assistance in a research project that we are undertaking this year at UNITEC.

The project aims to investigate the effectiveness of the SGID method of evaluating courses. This is the method which you are going to take part in with an independent SGID evaluator. We are also interested in finding out through the SGID those things which help and hinder your learning here at UNITEC.

What we are seeking from you is your permission for us, the research coordinators, to read the typed-up transcripts of your results in the same form as your course lecturer/s will receive them.

On our part, we give you an assurance that

- your raw handwritten data will NOT be viewed by us, only the typed-up transcript.
- permission from your course lecturer/s to read the typed-up transcripts will also be sought.
- the typed-up transcripts will preserve student anonymity and confidentiality and will be kept under lock and key. They will not be passed on to any unauthorised person.
- in any oral or written report, code numbers will be used without referring to lecturers' names or classes. Transcripts will not be reproduced in full but data from them will be reported as broad general findings.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely

Warren Shephard
Wendy Baker
Research Coordinators

Consent Form

To be completed by students over 16 years of age.

I have read and understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered. I understand that I may withdraw from this project at any time without having to give reasons and without penalty of any sort.

I agree to be involved in the study ☐

I do not wish to be involved in the study ☐

(Please tick one box only)

Name: _____
Please Print

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Dear

You have now had a SGID evaluation carried out on one of your classes and have received the results of this. We are now ready to set up a personalised interview time with you as the next stage of our research project. The aim of the interview is to check out your perceptions about

- the quality of feedback you have received from the SGID evaluation
- the changes that have taken place post SGID evaluation
- the value and effectiveness of the SGID process.

In order to use our interview time with you to best effect, we are providing you with a copy of the questions we intend to ask you. Please prepare responses in note form to each of the questions that will be asked in the interview. This reflection time on your part is crucial to the success of the interview.

Please bring along to the interview the questionnaire sheet with your prepared responses, together with the typed transcript of your SGID evaluation.

We anticipate that the interview will take no more than one hour. Both researchers will be present. We will contact you shortly to arrange an interview time that is convenient to you. In the meantime, if you require any assistance with the questionnaire, please let us know.

Thank you for your continued co-operation with this project. We hope that you are learning from the SGID experience just as we are.

Yours sincerely

Warren Shephard
Wendy Baker
Research Coordinators

SGID Interview Questionnaire

Feel free to make notes you want to on this sheet and bring it along to the interview.

A One hypothesis we are making is that SGID is a useful process by which students can readily identify quality issues (ie things that help and hinder learning)

A1 How useful do you think the SGID process is in identifying quality issues?

B1 B 1 Are there any comments you would like to make about the SGID process as regards its value to you personally?

B2 Are there any comments you would like to make about the SGID process as regards its value to the department and the institute as a whole?

C As a result of this study, some consideration may be given to using the SGID process to evaluate the quality of the total educational provision at UNITEC (ie quality of instruction, quality of facilities, quality of environment).

C1 To what extent is the SGID process able to give a complete picture about the quality of the total educational provision?

D In question 3 of the SGID process, students come up with strategies to improve the quality of their learning.

D1. Do the strategies for improvement as suggested by the students address the quality issues that they have identified?

D2 How viable are their suggested strategies for improvement?

E. What are your thoughts regarding the widespread adoption and implementation of the SGID process at UNITEC B

F What changes that you know of have been implemented as a result of the SGID process?

Appendix C

Report of All Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up

Appendix C: Report of All Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Hindrance										
Lecturer										
Personal Qualities										
34	Perhaps unintentionally belittles people. No straight forward answers to questions. Never getting direct answers.	25 83%	5 17%	0 0%	30	25 83%	5 17%	30	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Personal Qualities		25	5	0	30	25	5	30	0	1
% based on number of students		83%	17%	0%		83%	17%		0%	100%
Professional Practice										
17	Poor usage of switch system - light, video, TV.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change	
17	More practical hands-on/every day examples.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
17	Not enough explanation of terminology.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
17	Not long enough breaks.	10 77%	0 0%	3 23%	13	10 100%	0 0%	10	Change	
17	Consistency of tutors in what they say and do, eg down marking for late assignments.	6 46%	5 38%	2 15%	13	6 55%	5 45%	11	Change	
16	Inadequate written feedback.	14 93%	0 0%	1 7%	15	14 100%	0 0%	14	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Monotonous teaching methods, same method all the time, too much lecturer talk.	11 73%	4 27%	0 0%	15	11 73%	4 27%	15	Change	
21	Lack of "brief notes". No notes from class.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change	
21	Not enough time to write down points from discussions (13 agree).	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change	
21	Self reliance in learning from learning objectives.	15 71%	5 24%	1 5%	21	15 75%	5 25%	20	Change	
15	Lectures and tutorials not finishing on time.	8 80%	2 20%	0 0%	10	8 80%	2 20%	10		No Change
17	Classroom should be changed occasionally (4 disagree).	8 57%	4 29%	2 14%	14	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	
17	Leaving class during self-directed learning - 8 disagree.	13 93%	1 7%	0 0%	14	13 93%	1 7%	14	Change	
17	Sometimes mundane periods, ie switch off and lose attention. Not very interesting - most of it boring - no experiments.	8 57%	4 29%	2 14%	14	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	
34	Lack of information for assignments - format, possible resources, due dates - indecisive and inconsistent.	23 77%	6 20%	1 3%	30	23 79%	6 21%	29	Change	
34	Lecturer frequently not available outside of scheduled lectures.	20 67%	7 23%	3 10%	30	20 74%	7 26%	27		No Change
34	Often not enough feedback on assignments.	17 57%	12 40%	1 3%	30	17 59%	12 41%	29	Change	
15	Slow feedback on first assignment (8 people agree).	7 70%	0 0%	3 30%	10	7 100%	0 0%	7	Change	
34	Inappropriate use of group discussion.	22 73%	3 10%	5 17%	30	22 88%	3 12%	25	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
34	Always in the same group, no chance to gain new experience with other groups for discussion.	16 53%	12 40%	2 7%	30	16 57%	12 43%	28	Change	
34	More involvement in morning lectures.	22 73%	5 17%	3 10%	30	22 81%	5 19%	27	Change	
34	Often no follow up on queries, requests for information, eg grading assessment sheets, values in exams, etc.	20 67%	7 23%	3 10%	30	20 74%	7 26%	27	Change	
16	Too much homework - 11 people agree.	13 81%	0 0%	3 19%	16	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
15	Lack of organised contact with native speakers.	8 67%	4 33%	0 0%	12	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	
Sub totals for Professional Practice		338	95	37	470	338	95	433	22	2
% based on number of students		72%	20%	8%		78%	22%		92%	8%
Sub totals for Lecturer		363	100	37	500	363	100	463	22	3
% based on number of students		73%	20%	7%		78%	22%		88%	12%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Assessment										
17	Too many tests on irrelevant topics - 2 disagree.	6 43%	3 21%	5 36%	14	6 67%	3 33%	9	No Change	
16	Too much assessment.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11		
Sub totals for Assessment		13	7	10	30	13	7	20	1	1
% based on number of students		43%	23%	33%		65%	35%		50%	50%
Content										
17	Some data is too technical, eg graphs.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
17	Things in the syllabus that we don't need to know but have to learn, eg stationary anode tubes.	5 36%	6 43%	3 21%	14	5 43%	6 55%	11		
Sub totals for Content		22	6	3	31	22	6	28	0	2
% based on number of students		71%	19%	10%		79%	21%		0%	100%
Facilities & Services										
17	Self directed computers are not always connected to the printer.	5 29%	9 53%	3 18%	17	5 36%	9 64%	14	No Change	
16	Restricted lab access.	5 33%	8 53%	2 13%	15	5 38%	8 62%	13		
16	Open hours of the Computer Lab is not enough.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Learning Centre drop-in time is not enough.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
16	Noisy in the learning centre - crowded.	8 50%	4 25%	4 25%	16	8 67%	4 33%	12	No Change	
Sub totals for Facilities & Services		32	33	15	80	32	33	65	3	2
% based on number of students		40%	41%	19%		49%	51%		60%	40%
Materials										
17	Under resourced.	10 59%	6 35%	1 6%	17	10 63%	6 38%	16	No Change	
15	Big words in text book.	3 30%	0 0%	7 70%	10	3 100%	0 0%	3	No Change	
34	Lack of resources relating to animals ie models, examples in anatomy and physiology.	13 43%	15 50%	2 7%	30	13 46%	15 54%	28	Change	
17	The range of prescribed books presents some problems - not everyone with same books.	4 29%	5 36%	5 36%	14	4 44%	5 56%	9	Change	
17	Lack of books provided; (sometimes) they are too expensive for students. Text books should be issued free.	2 14%	9 64%	3 21%	14	2 18%	9 82%	11	Not Applicable	
15	The textbook explanations are difficult to understand - not detailed enough - 8 people agree.	3 25%	2 17%	7 58%	12	3 60%	2 40%	5	Change	
Sub totals for Materials		35	37	25	97	35	37	72	0	6
% based on number of students		36%	38%	26%		49%	51%		0%	100%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Organisation										
20	Not enough time in computer room.	2 10%	14 70%	4 20%	20	2 13%	14 88%	16	Change	
17	Cost of assignment materials, ie prior notice.	1 8%	8 62%	4 31%	13	1 11%	8 89%	9	Not Applicable	
17	Lack of adequate communication between tutors/students/other classes of the same subject -14 people agree.	9 69%	3 23%	1 8%	13	9 75%	3 25%	12	No Change	
17	Hand in date clashes with other courses.	5 38%	8 62%	0 0%	13	5 38%	8 62%	13	No Change	
17	More tutoring required during lab sessions.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
17	Technicians need to be introduced regularly.	12 71%	4 24%	1 6%	17	12 75%	4 25%	16	Change	
16	Not enough in-class learning hours.	6 40%	6 40%	3 20%	15	6 50%	6 50%	12	No Change	No Change
16	Course too concentrated for time span.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13	Not Applicable	
21	Assignments across courses all handed out at once.	5 24%	16 76%	0 0%	21	5 24%	16 76%	21	No Change	
34	Organisation of course activities is bad eg order of lectures.	17 57%	12 40%	1 3%	30	17 59%	12 41%	29	Not Applicable	
34	Delay on information is bad.	23 77%	6 20%	1 3%	30	23 79%	6 21%	29	Change	
17	Classes are too long and infrequent, eg physics once a week (2 disagree).	4 29%	6 43%	4 29%	14	4 40%	6 60%	10	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
15	Long study breaks.	2 20%	1 10%	7 70%	10	2 67%	1 33%	3		No Change
15	Long lectures, eg 2 hour blocks. Too many hours continuously.	4 40%	2 20%	4 40%	10	4 67%	2 33%	6	Change	Change
15	Anxiety in finding material in the library - encourages competitiveness.	2 20%	5 50%	3 30%	10	2 29%	5 71%	7		Not Applicable
34	Don't get informed of what we're going to do next. Better organisation to know when and where, eg farm visits.	27 90%	2 7%	1 3%	30	27 93%	2 7%	29	Change	
15	50 minutes not long enough for some tutorials.	1 10%	7 70%	2 20%	10	1 13%	7 88%	8	No Change	
34	Clinics need to be advised prior to us arriving on what and why we are there.	12 40%	12 40%	6 20%	30	12 50%	12 50%	24	No Change	No Change
17	Resources at wrong time of day; have at end of day.	8 57%	2 14%	4 29%	14	8 80%	2 20%	10	Change	
17	Better organisation, ie allow us to go home early or start early.	11 79%	1 7%	2 14%	14	11 92%	1 8%	12	Change	
17	Start too early in the morning (4 disagree).	8 57%	3 21%	3 21%	14	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
34	Would prefer more lectures from lecturer A	28 93%	2 7%	0 0%	30	28 93%	2 7%	30		No Change
15	No permanent classroom.	6 60%	0 0%	4 40%	10	6 100%	0 0%	6	Change	
34	Cancellation of classes and not being replaced.	24 80%	2 7%	4 13%	30	24 92%	2 8%	26	Change	
34	Changes of timetable when uninformed and at the last minute is bad. Timetable muck ups. Inadequate notice of changes.	15 45%	18 55%	0 0%	33	15 45%	18 55%	33		Change

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
34	Information from other lecturers is not passed on which is bad.	23 77%	4 13%	3 10%	30	23 85%	4 15%	27	Not Applicable	
16	Too many students in the class (one person suggested 10 or 12).	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8	Change	
15	Students are at different stages, the more advanced feel the learning is too slow, the beginners find it hard.	9 75%	0 0%	3 25%	12	9 100%	0 0%	9	Change	
16	Course fee too expensive. (Why has it been raised so much from the previous semester?)	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Organisation		291	165	82	538	291	165	456	14	15
% based on number of students		54%	31%	15%		64%	36%		48%	52%
Sub totals for Department		393	248	135	776	393	248	641	18	26
% based on number of students		51%	32%	17%		61%	39%		41%	59%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	Lack of heating.	10 77%	3 23%	0 0%	13	10 77%	3 23%	13	Change	
20	Too far from faculty.	2 10%	12 60%	6 30%	20	2 14%	12 86%	14	Not Applicable	
20	Not enough parking.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Chairs and desks are uncomfortable (not everyone agrees).	0 0%	13 65%	7 35%	20	0 0%	13 100%	13	Not Applicable	
20	OHP screen in awkward place for some students.	15 75%	0 0%	5 25%	20	15 100%	0 0%	15	Change	
17	Lack of heating. Cold. Icicles hanging off the visual aids. Uncomfortable learning environment.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
20	The classroom: too small, stuffy and not enough seats for combined classes.	1 5%	18 90%	1 5%	20	1 5%	18 95%	19	Change	
17	No taps for drinking water.	0 0%	17 100%	0 0%	17	0 0%	17 100%	17	No Change	
17	Difficult to find rooms.	10 77%	0 0%	3 23%	13	10 100%	0 0%	10	No Change	
16	The room lighting - the sun's reflection.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
21	Outside distractions, eg car alarms, lawnmower, cell phones.	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change	
17	Room temperature too stuffy then freezing.	6 43%	8 57%	0 0%	14	6 43%	8 57%	14	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Too hot in the afternoon in the classroom.	3 20%	1 7%	11 73%	15	3 75%	1 25%	4		Change
15	We need more space in the carpark and the yellow bus is infrequent/inconvenient.	3 25%	6 50%	3 25%	12	3 33%	6 67%	9		Change
16	Noisy, eg lawnmowing during the day, especially Monday mornings, make it difficult to study.	6 38%	10 63%	0 0%	16	6 38%	10 63%	16	No Change	
16	Not enough carpark spaces.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13		Not Applicable
Sub totals for Environment		105	122	43	270	105	122	227	7	9
% based on number of students		39%	45%	16%		46%	54%		44%	56%

Services

17	Cashflow on this side of the campus there is none here.	0 0%	12 92%	1 8%	13	0 0%	12 100%	12		Not Applicable
17	Restricted availability of required texts. Texts not available at beginning of course.	6 35%	9 53%	2 12%	17	6 40%	9 60%	15		Not Applicable
17	Reading room hours too few. Lack of books and information in resource and reading room.	3 18%	14 82%	0 0%	17	3 18%	14 82%	17	No Change	
17	Library inadequate in the Arch & Dsgn building with limited resource materials; this is a big one for us. Limited access to library services and facilities.	3 23%	10 77%	0 0%	13	3 23%	10 77%	13	No Change	
17	Food in cafe is expensive and tasteless.	0 0%	12 92%	1 8%	13	0 0%	12 100%	12	No Change	
17	Hours of the bookshop, ie closed in the evenings.	0 0%	9 69%	4 31%	13	0 0%	9 100%	9		Not Applicable
17	Need more food at cafe and better food.	2 12%	14 82%	1 6%	17	2 13%	14 88%	16	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Resources on the other side of the campus.	3 23%	10 77%	0 0%	13	3 23%	10 77%	13	No Change	
17	Better games in the cafe - more modern ones - for people who use machines -5 people agree	1 8%	7 54%	5 38%	13	1 13%	7 88%	8	Not Applicable	
20	Not enough variety of food in the cafeteria and often by 12.30 there is not any left.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20	Not Applicable	
17	Reading room hours.	1 8%	11 85%	1 8%	13	1 8%	11 92%	12	No Change	
16	Library hours - difficult for shift and full time workers.	0 0%	8 50%	8 50%	16	0 0%	8 100%	8	No Change	No Change
21	Lateness of shuttle bus, 5 out of 5 people who use it.	2 10%	3 14%	16 76%	21	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
15	No study area - student lounge.	0 0%	10 100%	0 0%	10	0 0%	10 100%	10	No Change	
34	Library resources are bad. Lack of relevant resources for our course.	7 23%	23 77%	0 0%	30	7 23%	23 77%	30	Not Applicable	
17	Cafe food sux and is too expensive.	2 14%	10 71%	2 14%	14	2 17%	10 83%	12	Not Applicable	
15	Noise in library. Library too small.	2 20%	7 70%	1 10%	10	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable	
15	Cafe too expensive.	0 0%	10 100%	0 0%	10	0 0%	10 100%	10	No Change	
17	No pub, 12 people agree.	0 0%	9 64%	5 36%	14	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	
16	Books in the library are too old and not enough.	9 56%	5 31%	2 13%	16	9 64%	5 36%	14	Change	
16	Not enough photocopiers in the library.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Cafeteria food only for Westerners (no Japanese or Korean food). Someone wanted "kimchi".	4 25%	4 25%	8 50%	16	4 50%	4 50%	8		Change
15	The section in the library is not useful.	3 25%	7 58%	2 17%	12	3 30%	7 70%	10		Change
Sub totals for Services		57	228	62	347	57	228	285	10	13
% based on number of students		16%	66%	18%		20%	80%		43%	57%
Sub totals for Institution		162	350	105	617	162	350	512	17	22
% based on number of students		26%	57%	17%		32%	68%		44%	56%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Class Dynamics										
16	Annoying, argumentative, disruptive, uncompromising students waste valuable time.	11 73%	1 7%	3 20%	15	11 92%	1 8%	12	Change	
16	Lack of group participation.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
21	Not full class participation.	17 81%	4 19%	0 0%	21	17 81%	4 19%	21		No Change
34	Continual disruptions from chatterboxes in lectures.	20 67%	8 27%	2 7%	30	20 71%	8 29%	28	Change	
15	Students late.	2 20%	6 60%	2 20%	10	2 25%	6 75%	8		Not Applicable
17	Classmates distractions during lectures.	13 93%	0 0%	1 7%	14	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
15	Interference during lectures - individuals asking personal questions and taking up time.	4 40%	5 50%	1 10%	10	4 44%	5 56%	9		Change
17	Class noise too high - 5 people disagree.	12 86%	0 0%	2 14%	14	12 100%	0 0%	12	Change	
Sub totals for Class Dynamics		95	24	11	130	95	24	119	5	3
% based on number of students		73%	18%	8%		80%	20%		63%	38%
Outside Factors										
21	The slowness of student services with loans.	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Having to work outside UNITEC to earn money.	1 7%	7 47%	7 47%	15	1 13%	7 88%	8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
16	Finding money for course fees, stationery, books, living, food & petrol.	2 13%	8 50%	6 38%	16	2 20%	8 80%	10		Not Applicable
16	Other commitments - work, other subjects & sports means lack of personal time.	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		6	22	40	68	6	22	28	2	2
% based on number of students		9%	32%	59%		21%	79%		50%	50%
Personal Factors										
17	Lab reports not compulsory and not handed in for feedback - 14 people agree.	5 29%	10 59%	2 12%	17	5 33%	10 67%	15		Change
21	English as a second language.	4 19%	1 5%	16 76%	21	4 80%	1 20%	5	Not Applicable	
16	Own lack of study techniques - ten people.	2 13%	1 6%	13 81%	16	2 67%	1 33%	3	Not Applicable	
16	Own personal motivation.	12 75%	0 0%	4 25%	16	12 100%	0 0%	12		Not Applicable
16	Personal erratic study habits.	7 47%	3 20%	5 33%	15	7 70%	3 30%	10		Not Applicable
17	Don't get paid - incentive.	8 57%	3 21%	3 21%	14	8 73%	3 27%	11		Not Applicable
15	Stress - not being able to keep up with recommended reading.	5 50%	3 30%	2 20%	10	5 63%	3 38%	8		Not Applicable
15	We arn't trying to speak Japanese as often as we should.	9 75%	2 17%	1 8%	12	9 82%	2 18%	11	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
15	Personal matters.	5 42%	1 8%	6 50%	12	5 83%	1 17%	6	Not Applicable	
	Sub totals for Personal Factors	57	24	52	133	57	24	81	4	5
	% based on number of students	43%	18%	39%		70%	30%		44%	56%
	Sub totals for Students	158	70	103	331	158	70	228	11	10
	% based on number of students	48%	21%	31%		69%	31%		52%	48%
	*** Totals for Hindrance	1076	768	380	2224	1076	768	1844	68	61
	% based on number of students	48%	35%	17%		58%	42%		53%	47%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Suggestion										
Lecturer										
Professional Practice										
17	Simplify technical handouts.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	No Change	
17	Clarify verbally the objectives in the assignments.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
20	Examples of practical application of business communication in relation to business.	12 60%	8 40%	0 0%	20	12 60%	8 40%	20	Change	
17	Tutors should know more about the function of videos/slides.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change	
20	More time must be spent on logbook preparation.	7 35%	11 55%	2 10%	20	7 39%	11 61%	18	Change	
20	Have a longer break.	17 85%	3 15%	0 0%	20	17 85%	3 15%	20	Change	
17	Consistency between tutors & classes.	5 38%	5 38%	3 23%	13	5 50%	5 50%	10	Change	Change
17	More everyday examples in relation to everyday situations.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
16	More group work to allow for feedback and interaction.	9 56%	7 44%	0 0%	16	9 56%	7 44%	16	Change	
21	Field trips or any outside activities (maybe once every three weeks).	2 10%	17 85%	1 5%	20	2 11%	17 89%	19	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
21	Depth of research for assignments required to be explained and guidelines to get full marks.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change	
21	A few brief notes - handouts. More useful brief & effective.	20 95%	1 5%	0 0%	21	20 95%	1 5%	21	Change	
21	More discussion about assignments.	15 71%	6 29%	0 0%	21	15 71%	6 29%	21	Change	
16	A short break in the middle of class of 2-5 minutes will improve concentration span.	9 56%	6 38%	1 6%	16	9 60%	6 40%	15	Change	
16	Variations in teaching method.	10 67%	2 13%	3 20%	15	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
16	Tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments.	9 60%	3 20%	3 20%	15	9 75%	3 25%	12		Not Applicable
16	More written feedback.	11 73%	2 13%	2 13%	15	11 85%	2 15%	13	Change	
16	Breaks in class - short five minutes to break it up.	3 20%	7 47%	5 33%	15	3 30%	7 70%	10		Not Applicable
34	Only be expected to know things that we have covered.	25 83%	5 17%	0 0%	30	25 83%	5 17%	30	Change	
17	More student input, eg in terms of course design and planning.	7 50%	6 43%	1 7%	14	7 54%	6 46%	13		Not Applicable
34	Its our money, our choice, we are adults, treat us accordingly.	19 63%	10 33%	1 3%	30	19 66%	10 34%	29		Not Applicable
17	Ask relaxed questions directed at people so they don't feel threatened. - 1 disagree	11 79%	2 14%	1 7%	14	11 85%	2 15%	13	Change	
15	More direct feedback - "If it's not right tell me."	7 70%	2 20%	1 10%	10	7 78%	2 22%	9	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	More interesting lectures - perhaps more experiments, practicals, fun, videos and laser discs, etc.	8 57%	6 43%	0 0%	14	8 57%	6 43%	14	Change	
15	Tutorials - more structure, time to review process in tutorials "How's it going?". Maybe some tutorials used for working on assignments with tutor assistance.	6 60%	2 20%	2 20%	10	6 75%	2 25%	8	Change	
15	Try to include reviews of material taught earlier in the course.	10 83%	2 17%	0 0%	12	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
15	Keep on giving us extra homework.	8 67%	3 25%	1 8%	12	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
15	Teachers could speak at normal speed when using vocabulary already taught.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
16	Visit the relevant places to the class, eg companies, the stock exchange, auction, etc.	11 69%	3 19%	2 13%	16	11 79%	3 21%	14	Change	
15	When giving feedback please give constructive criticism as well as encouragement.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
15	Use more active methods and activities in class - especially Monday mornings.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
16	More visual information from TV news in class.	10 63%	5 31%	1 6%	16	10 67%	5 33%	15	Change	
16	Concentrate on weak points (students would like a bit more choice over what they study giving them the chance to improve in areas that they feel not good about, eg reading, listening, etc).	8 50%	6 38%	2 13%	16	8 57%	6 43%	14		No Change
15	We need more help with pronunciation - 8 people agree.	9 75%	0 0%	3 25%	12	9 100%	0 0%	9	Change	

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Professional Practice	379	139	40	558	379	139	518	25	9
% based on number of students	68%	25%	7%		73%	27%		74%	26%
Sub totals for Lecturer	379	139	40	558	379	139	518	25	9
% based on number of students	68%	25%	7%		73%	27%		74%	26%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Content										
17	More practical work.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
20	More emphasis on computer skills.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20		Change
16	More computer time.	10 63%	2 13%	4 25%	16	10 63%	2 13%	12	Change	
15	More balance in content - teach both the good & bad aspects of the culture and the people - 11 people agree.	7 58%	4 33%	1 8%	12	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Content		35	25	5	65	35	25	60	3	1
% based on number of students		54%	38%	8%		58%	42%		75%	25%
Facilities & Services										
17	Computer rooms open in the weekends and paper for printers available.	6 35%	8 47%	3 18%	17	6 43%	8 57%	14		Change
17	Hook up printer in SDL area.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	No Change	No Change
16	More lab time and free labs during the day.	6 40%	3 20%	6 40%	15	6 67%	3 33%	9	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
15	Study area in School for Health.	2 20%	6 60%	2 20%	10	2 25%	6 75%	8		Not Applicable
16	More time in Learning Centre & Mac Lab.	10 63%	3 19%	3 19%	16	10 77%	3 23%	13	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicated brain.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13		Change
16	Colour TV & Video in the classroom.	5 31%	6 38%	5 31%	16	5 45%	6 55%	11	No Change	
Sub totals for Facilities & Services		42	42	23	107	42	42	84	2	5
% based on number of students		39%	39%	21%		50%	50%		29%	71%
Materials										
17	Find a more relevant textbook.	4 29%	9 64%	1 7%	14	4 31%	9 69%	13		Not Applicable
34	Up to date animal & anatomy videos.	7 23%	13 43%	10 33%	30	7 35%	13 65%	20		Change
17	More textbooks to be available.	5 33%	10 67%	0 0%	15	5 33%	10 67%	15		Not Applicable
15	Have light, humourous, kids books, movies, etc for study periods	9 75%	1 8%	2 17%	12	9 90%	1 10%	10	Change	
15	Need new resources in the Learning centre - video, tapes, etc.	7 58%	4 33%	1 8%	12	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Materials		32	37	14	83	32	37	69	2	3
% based on number of students		39%	45%	17%		46%	54%		40%	60%
Organisation										
16	Both classes are on last period at end of day - bad time to learn; move to different period.	5 33%	6 40%	4 27%	15	5 45%	6 55%	11	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
21	Better organisation of each department - eg handing out assignments.	2 10%	12 57%	7 33%	21	2 14%	12 86%	14	No Change	
16	More convenient timetabling to ensure that we don't have large gaps.	5 33%	5 33%	5 33%	15	5 50%	5 50%	10	No Change	No Change
16	More class hours - back to 40 hours in class and 20 hours out of class.	4 27%	5 33%	6 40%	15	4 44%	5 56%	9	No Change	
16	Orientation time - more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading, etc.	2 13%	3 19%	11 69%	16	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
16	For full timers - more options as to class time.	2 13%	7 44%	7 44%	16	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
34	Tell the lecturers the same things as we get told, eg Lecturer B was double booked.	23 77%	3 10%	4 13%	30	23 88%	3 12%	26	Not Applicable	
17	Longer lunch times - 2 disagree.	1 7%	10 71%	3 21%	14	1 9%	10 91%	11	Not Applicable	
17	Split classes over two days, eg one hour per topic a day - 2 disagree.	1 7%	10 71%	3 21%	14	1 9%	10 91%	11	No Change	
17	Resource at the end of the day.	11 69%	4 25%	1 6%	16	11 73%	4 27%	15	Change	
34	Syllabus handed out at the beginning of the year.	4 13%	1 3%	25 83%	30	4 80%	1 20%	5	Not Applicable	
34	One person marking the the test for consistency of marking	19 63%	6 20%	5 17%	30	19 76%	6 24%	25	Change	
34	Better organisation of course scheduling. Present content in the right order eg anaesthetics too late.	8 27%	17 57%	5 17%	30	8 32%	17 68%	25	Change	
34	Expand the length of course, eg Jan to Dec. - 26 people agree	0 0%	0 0%	30 100%	30	0 #Num!	0 #Num!	0	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
34	Spread assignments more evenly. Re-timetable spread of assignments and tests to give time in between.	14 47%	16 53%	0 0%	30	14 47%	16 53%	30		Change
34	At interviews and in course brochure be more specific about subjects we cover outside clinics - costs, etc.	0 0%	0 0%	30 100%	30	0 #Num!	0 #Num!	0	Not Applicable	
34	Flexible timetable at the beginning of the year to have general idea of what is expected. Course outlined at the beginning of the year.	11 37%	6 20%	13 43%	30	11 65%	6 35%	17		Change
15	Meet more native speakers so we can understand current cultural thinking & actions.	8 67%	3 25%	1 8%	12	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
16	More different tutors - concentrate on different skill, eg reading, writing, speaking.	6 38%	4 25%	6 38%	16	6 60%	4 40%	10	Change	Change
Sub totals for Organisation		126	118	166	410	126	118	244	10	9
% based on number of students		31%	29%	40%		52%	48%		53%	47%
Sub totals for Department		235	222	208	665	235	222	457	17	18
% based on number of students		35%	33%	31%		51%	49%		49%	51%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	Outside seating under cover perhaps with picnic tables.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	Not Applicable	
17	Designated smoking areas outside.- 10 people agree	0 0%	6 46%	7 54%	13	0 0%	6 100%	6	Not Applicable	
17	Get the board fixed - too squeaky - minor point.	4 24%	13 76%	0 0%	17	4 24%	13 76%	17	No Change	
20	Desks that are adjustable (the tall people especially felt that the desks were too low).	1 5%	15 75%	4 20%	20	1 6%	15 94%	16	Not Applicable	
17	Get water facilities. Don't like drinking in the toilets. Free filtered water, eg bottles.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
17	Improve heating system - hottie & milo. Climatic improvements to rooms.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
17	More rubbish bins and empty ones that are there.	3 23%	9 69%	1 8%	13	3 25%	9 75%	12	Not Applicable	
20	Move closer to the faculty.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Bigger rooms.	1 5%	19 95%	0 0%	20	1 5%	19 95%	20	No Change	
20	Shift OHP screen.	16 80%	1 5%	3 15%	20	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
20	Air conditioning. - 7 people agree	7 35%	10 50%	3 15%	20	7 41%	10 59%	17	Not Applicable	
17	Better parking facilities.	1 8%	12 92%	0 0%	13	1 8%	12 92%	13	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Air conditioner for summer.	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10	Change	
16	To improve the carparking problem extend the area.	4 25%	5 31%	7 44%	16	4 44%	5 56%	9	Not Applicable	
16	Mow on Sundays.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15	No Change	
Sub totals for Environment		83	133	35	251	83	133	216	7	8
% based on number of students		33%	53%	14%		38%	62%		47%	53%
Services										
17	We want a cashflow machine on this side of the campus.	1 8%	12 92%	0 0%	13	1 8%	12 92%	13	Not Applicable	
17	More photocopy machines	2 12%	15 88%	0 0%	17	2 12%	15 88%	17	No Change	
17	Better & cheaper food. Better attitude of personnel. Another cafe that is sunny and another operator. Healthier food catering for vegans.	4 24%	11 65%	2 12%	17	4 27%	11 73%	15	No Change	
17	A bar. Hot toddy for all the colds we have.	2 12%	13 76%	2 12%	17	2 13%	13 87%	15	No Change	
17	Academic environment needs to be supported by more resources.	7 41%	10 59%	0 0%	17	7 41%	10 59%	17	No Change	
17	Gym too expensive and needs more facilities.	6 35%	7 41%	4 24%	17	6 46%	7 54%	13	Not Applicable	
17	Bring back the non stop shuttle service or improve access to the library.	2 15%	7 54%	4 31%	13	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable	
17	Extension of library and study room hours.	6 35%	11 65%	0 0%	17	6 35%	11 65%	17	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Cafeteria needs better seating and more interesting food selection & prices. Would like coke and not just pepsi.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	No Change	
17	Extend bookshop/resource room hours, ie 8:00pm on campus.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	Not Applicable	
17	Sky TV in cafe.- 8 people agree	0 0%	9 69%	4 31%	13	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	
17	Have cash vending machines for changing notes.	1 8%	10 77%	2 15%	13	1 9%	10 91%	11	Not Applicable	
20	Have more food in the cafeteria.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20	Not Applicable	
17	Extend cafe hours early morning till late.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	Change	Change
16	Longer library hours - open until 10pm.	1 6%	15 94%	0 0%	16	1 6%	15 94%	16	No Change	
17	More on campus entertainment eg pool tables and decent radio station.	2 14%	12 86%	0 0%	14	2 14%	12 86%	14	Not Applicable	
34	More resources related to this course in library & labs.	11 37%	19 63%	0 0%	30	11 37%	19 63%	30	No Change	
15	Library - noise on door fixed, silent areas monitored, one more photocopier.	4 40%	5 50%	1 10%	10	4 44%	5 56%	9	Not Applicable	
34	Access to phone in blue house (preferably free).	0 0%	23 77%	7 23%	30	0 0%	23 100%	23	No Change	
17	Better cafe food, more variety.	1 7%	11 79%	2 14%	14	1 8%	11 92%	12	Not Applicable	
17	Free tea and coffee.	0 0%	14 100%	0 0%	14	0 0%	14 100%	14	Not Applicable	
17	A pub.	0 0%	13 93%	1 7%	14	0 0%	13 100%	13	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	More photocopiers in the library (there is always a big queue of students).	3 19%	9 56%	4 25%	16	3 25%	9 75%	12		Not Applicable
16	More Asian food in cafeteria.	6 38%	3 19%	7 44%	16	6 67%	3 33%	9		Change
16	To install more cassette tape recorders in the library.	5 31%	4 25%	7 44%	16	5 56%	4 44%	9		No Change
15	Increase the number and variety of cultural texts in the library.	6 50%	5 42%	1 8%	12	6 55%	5 45%	11	Change	
16	More up-to-date books, magazines, videos, etc in the library & Learning Centre.	6 38%	6 38%	4 25%	16	6 50%	6 50%	12		Not Applicable
Sub totals for Services		91	291	53	435	91	291	382	10	17
% based on number of students		21%	67%	12%		24%	76%		37%	63%
Sub totals for Institution		174	424	88	686	174	424	598	17	25
% based on number of students		25%	62%	13%		29%	71%		40%	60%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Class Dynamics										
17	Whole class participation rather than one person answering it all; give us a chance.	13 93%	0 0%	1 7%	14	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
Sub totals for Class Dynamics		13	0	1	14	13	0	13	1	0
% based on number of students		93%	0%	7%		100%	0%		100%	0%
Outside Factors										
21	More efficiency at student services - quicker with loans	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		0	2	19	21	0	2	2	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	10%	90%		0%	100%		100%	0%
Personal Factors										
17	Everyone should get paid equally at the same time.	0 0%	9 64%	5 36%	14	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	
16	More free talks with native speakers.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Change	
15	We need to try to speak more language, eg in the breaks.	9 75%	2 17%	1 8%	12	9 82%	2 18%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		15	18	9	42	15	18	33	1	2
% based on number of students		36%	43%	21%		45%	55%		33%	67%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Students	28	20	29	77	28	20	48	3	2
% based on number of students	36%	26%	38%		58%	42%		60%	40%
 *** Totals for Suggestion	 816	 805	 365	 1986	 816	 805	 1621	 62	 54
% based on number of students	41%	41%	18%		50%	50%		53%	47%

Appendix D

Report of All Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up With Majority Not Applicables Deleted

Appendix D: Report of Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up With majority Not Applicables Deleted

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Hindrance										
Lecturer										
Personal Qualities										
34	Perhaps unintentionally belittles people. No straight forward answers to questions. Never getting direct answers.	25 83%	5 17%	0 0%	30	25 83%	5 17%	30	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Personal Qualities		25	5	0	30	25	5	30	0	1
% based on number of students		83%	17%	0%		83%	17%		0%	100%
Professional Practice										
17	Not enough explanation of terminology.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
17	Poor usage of switch system - light, video, TV.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change	
17	Not long enough breaks.	10 77%	0 0%	3 23%	13	10 100%	0 0%	10	Change	
17	Consistency of tutors in what they say and do, eg down marking for late assignments.	6 46%	5 38%	2 15%	13	6 55%	5 45%	11	Change	
17	More practical hands-on/every day examples.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
21	Not enough time to write down points from discussions (13 agree).	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
21	Self reliance in learning from learning objectives.	15 71%	5 24%	1 5%	21	15 75%	5 25%	20	Change	
21	Lack of "brief notes". No notes from class.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change	
16	Monotonous teaching methods, same method all the time, too much lecturer talk.	11 73%	4 27%	0 0%	15	11 73%	4 27%	15	Change	
16	Inadequate written feedback.	14 93%	0 0%	1 7%	15	14 100%	0 0%	14	Change	
34	Always in the same group, no chance to gain new experience with other groups for discussion.	16 53%	12 40%	2 7%	30	16 57%	12 43%	28	Change	
34	More involvement in morning lectures.	22 73%	5 17%	3 10%	30	22 81%	5 19%	27	Change	
34	Inappropriate use of group discussion.	22 73%	3 10%	5 17%	30	22 88%	3 12%	25	Change	
34	Often no follow up on queries, requests for information, eg grading assessment sheets, values in exams, etc.	20 67%	7 23%	3 10%	30	20 74%	7 26%	27	Change	
34	Often not enough feedback on assignments.	17 57%	12 40%	1 3%	30	17 59%	12 41%	29	Change	
17	Classroom should be changed occasionally (4 disagree).	8 57%	4 29%	2 14%	14	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	
15	Lectures and tutorials not finishing on time.	8 80%	2 20%	0 0%	10	8 80%	2 20%	10		No Change
15	Slow feedback on first assignment (8 people agree).	7 70%	0 0%	3 30%	10	7 100%	0 0%	7	Change	
17	Sometimes mundane periods, ie switch off and lose attention. Not very interesting - most of it boring - no experiments.	8 57%	4 29%	2 14%	14	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Leaving class during self-directed learning - 8 disagree.	13 93%	1 7%	0 0%	14	13 93%	1 7%	14	Change	
34	Lecturer frequently not available outside of scheduled lectures.	20 67%	7 23%	3 10%	30	20 74%	7 26%	27		No Change
34	Lack of information for assignments - format, possible resources, due dates - indecisive and inconsistent.	23 77%	6 20%	1 3%	30	23 79%	6 21%	29	Change	
15	Lack of organised contact with native speakers.	8 67%	4 33%	0 0%	12	8 67%	4 33%	12	Change	
16	Too much homework - 11 people agree.	13 81%	0 0%	3 19%	16	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
Sub totals for Professional Practice		338	95	37	470	338	95	433	22	2
% based on number of students		72%	20%	8%		78%	22%		92%	8%
Sub totals for Lecturer		363	100	37	500	363	100	463	22	3
% based on number of students		73%	20%	7%		78%	22%		88%	12%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Assessment										
17	Too many tests on irrelevant topics - 2 disagree.	6 43%	3 21%	5 36%	14	6 67%	3 33%	9	No Change	
16	Too much assessment.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11		
Sub totals for Assessment		13	7	10	30	13	7	20	1	1
% based on number of students		43%	23%	33%		65%	35%		50%	50%
Content										
17	Some data is too technical, eg graphs.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
17	Things in the syllabus that we don't need to know but have to learn, eg stationary anode tubes.	5 36%	6 43%	3 21%	14	5 45%	6 55%	11		
Sub totals for Content		22	6	3	31	22	6	28	0	2
% based on number of students		71%	19%	10%		79%	21%		0%	100%
Facilities & Services										
17	Self directed computers are not always connected to the printer.	5 29%	9 53%	3 18%	17	5 36%	9 64%	14	No Change	
16	Restricted lab access.	5 33%	8 53%	2 13%	15	5 38%	8 62%	13		
16	Noisy in the learning centre - crowded.	8 50%	4 25%	4 25%	16	8 67%	4 33%	12	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Learning Centre drop-in time is not enough.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
16	Open hours of the Computer Lab is not enough.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15		Change
Sub totals for Facilities & Services		32	33	15	80	32	33	65	3	2
% based on number of students		40%	41%	19%		49%	51%		60%	40%
Materials										
17	Under resourced.	10 59%	6 35%	1 6%	17	10 63%	6 38%	16		No Change
17	The range of prescribed books presents some problems - not everyone with same books.	4 29%	5 36%	5 36%	14	4 44%	5 56%	9		Change
34	Lack of resources relating to animals ie models, examples in anatomy and physiology.	13 43%	15 50%	2 7%	30	13 46%	15 54%	28		Change
17	Lack of books provided; (sometimes) they are too expensive for students. Text books should be issued free.	2 14%	9 64%	3 21%	14	2 18%	9 82%	11		Not Applicable
Sub totals for Materials		29	35	11	75	29	35	64	0	4
% based on number of students		39%	47%	15%		45%	55%		0%	100%
Organisation										
20	Not enough time in computer room.	2 10%	14 70%	4 20%	20	2 13%	14 88%	16		Change
17	Hand in date clashes with other courses.	5 38%	8 62%	0 0%	13	5 38%	8 62%	13	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Lack of adequate communication between tutors/students/other classes of the same subject -14 people agree.	9 69%	3 23%	1 8%	13	9 75%	3 25%	12		No Change
17	Cost of assignment materials, ie prior notice.	1 8%	8 62%	4 31%	13	1 11%	8 89%	9		Not Applicable
17	Technicians need to be introduced regularly.	12 71%	4 24%	1 6%	17	12 75%	4 25%	16	Change	
17	More tutoring required during lab sessions.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
16	Course too concentrated for time span.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13		Not Applicable
16	Not enough in-class learning hours.	6 40%	6 40%	3 20%	15	6 50%	6 50%	12	No Change	No Change
21	Assignments across courses all handed out at once.	5 24%	16 76%	0 0%	21	5 24%	16 76%	21	No Change	
34	Clinics need to be advised prior to us arriving on what and why we are there.	12 40%	12 40%	6 20%	30	12 50%	12 50%	24	No Change	No Change
34	Information from other lecturers is not passed on which is bad.	23 77%	4 13%	3 10%	30	23 85%	4 15%	27		Not Applicable
34	Changes of timetable when uninformed and at the last minute is bad. Timetable muck ups. Inadequate notice of changes.	15 45%	18 55%	0 0%	33	15 45%	18 55%	33		Change
34	Don't get informed of what we're going to do next. Better organisation to know when and where, eg farm visits.	27 90%	2 7%	1 3%	30	27 93%	2 7%	29	Change	
34	Would prefer more lectures from lecturer A	28 93%	2 7%	0 0%	30	28 93%	2 7%	30		No Change

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Start too early in the morning (4 disagree).	8 57%	3 21%	3 21%	14	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
17	Better organisation, ie allow us to go home early or start early.	11 79%	1 7%	2 14%	14	11 92%	1 8%	12	Change	
17	Resources at wrong time of day; have at end of day.	8 57%	2 14%	4 29%	14	8 80%	2 20%	10	Change	
34	Organisation of course activities is bad eg order of lectures.	17 57%	12 40%	1 3%	30	17 59%	12 41%	29		Not Applicable
34	Cancellation of classes and not being replaced.	24 80%	2 7%	4 13%	30	24 92%	2 8%	26	Change	
34	Delay on information is bad.	23 77%	6 20%	1 3%	30	23 79%	6 21%	29	Change	
15	50 minutes not long enough for some tutorials.	1 10%	7 70%	2 20%	10	1 13%	7 88%	8	No Change	
15	No permanent classroom.	6 60%	0 0%	4 40%	10	6 100%	0 0%	6	Change	
15	Anxiety in finding material in the library - encourages competitiveness.	2 20%	5 50%	3 30%	10	2 29%	5 71%	7		Not Applicable
15	Long lectures, eg 2 hour blocks. Too many hours continuously.	4 40%	2 20%	4 40%	10	4 67%	2 33%	6	Change	Change
17	Classes are too long and infrequent, eg physics once a week (2 disagree).	4 29%	6 43%	4 29%	14	4 40%	6 60%	10	No Change	
15	Students are at different stages, the more advanced feel the learning is too slow, the beginners find it hard.	9 75%	0 0%	3 25%	12	9 100%	0 0%	9	Change	
16	Course fee too expensive. (Why has it been raised so much from the previous semester?)	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10		Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Organisation	286	159	67	512	286	159	445	14	13
% based on number of students	56%	31%	13%		64%	36%		52%	48%
Sub totals for Department	382	240	106	728	382	240	622	18	22
% based on number of students	52%	33%	15%		61%	39%		45%	55%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	No taps for drinking water.	0 0%	17 100%	0 0%	17	0 0%	17 100%	17	No Change	
17	Difficult to find rooms.	10 77%	0 0%	3 23%	13	10 100%	0 0%	10	No Change	
20	The classroom: too small, stuffy and not enough seats for combined classes.	1 5%	18 90%	1 5%	20	1 5%	18 95%	19	Change	
20	Chairs and desks are uncomfortable (not everyone agrees).	0 0%	13 65%	7 35%	20	0 0%	13 100%	13	Not Applicable	
20	Not enough parking.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Too far from faculty.	2 10%	12 60%	6 30%	20	2 14%	12 86%	14	Not Applicable	
20	OHP screen in awkward place for some students.	15 75%	0 0%	5 25%	20	15 100%	0 0%	15	Change	
17	Lack of heating.	10 77%	3 23%	0 0%	13	10 77%	3 23%	13	Change	
17	Lack of heating. Cold. Icicles hanging off the visual aids. Uncomfortable learning environment.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
21	Outside distractions, eg car alarms, lawnmower, cell phones.	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change	
16	The room lighting - the sun's reflection.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
17	Room temperature too stuffy then freezing.	6 43%	8 57%	0 0%	14	6 43%	8 57%	14	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Noisy, eg lawnmowing during the day, especially Monday mornings, make it difficult to study.	6 38%	10 63%	0 0%	16	6 38%	10 63%	16	No Change	
16	Not enough carpark spaces.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Not Applicable	
15	We need more space in the carpark and the yellow bus is infrequent/inconvenient.	3 25%	6 50%	3 25%	12	3 33%	6 67%	9	Change	
Sub totals for Environment		102	121	32	255	102	121	223	7	8
% based on number of students		40%	47%	13%		46%	54%		47%	53%
Services										
17	Reading room hours.	1 8%	11 85%	1 8%	13	1 8%	11 92%	12	No Change	
17	Resources on the other side of the campus.	3 23%	10 77%	0 0%	13	3 23%	10 77%	13	No Change	
17	Cashflow on this side of the campus there is none here.	0 0%	12 92%	1 8%	13	0 0%	12 100%	12	Not Applicable	
17	Better games in the cafe - more modern ones - for people who use machines -5 people agree	1 8%	7 54%	5 38%	13	1 13%	7 88%	8	Not Applicable	
17	Library inadequate in the Arch & Dsgn building with limited resource materials; this is a big one for us. Limited access to library services and facilities.	3 23%	10 77%	0 0%	13	3 23%	10 77%	13	No Change	
20	Not enough variety of food in the cafeteria and often by 12.30 there is not any left.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20	Not Applicable	
17	Food in cafe is expensive and tasteless.	0 0%	12 92%	1 8%	13	0 0%	12 100%	12	No Change	
17	Hours of the bookshop, ie closed in the evenings.	0 0%	9 69%	4 31%	13	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Need more food at cafe and better food.	2 12%	14 82%	1 6%	17	2 13%	14 88%	16	No Change	
17	Restricted availability of required texts. Texts not available at beginning of course.	6 35%	9 53%	2 12%	17	6 40%	9 60%	15		Not Applicable
17	Reading room hours too few. Lack of books and information in resource and reading room.	3 18%	14 82%	0 0%	17	3 18%	14 82%	17	No Change	
34	Library resources are bad. Lack of relevant resources for our course.	7 23%	23 77%	0 0%	30	7 23%	23 77%	30		Not Applicable
15	Cafe too expensive.	0 0%	10 100%	0 0%	10	0 0%	10 100%	10	No Change	
15	No study area - student lounge.	0 0%	10 100%	0 0%	10	0 0%	10 100%	10	No Change	
17	Cafe food sux and is too expensive.	2 14%	10 71%	2 14%	14	2 17%	10 83%	12		Not Applicable
17	No pub, 12 people agree.	0 0%	9 64%	5 36%	14	0 0%	9 100%	9		Not Applicable
15	Noise in library. Library too small.	2 20%	7 70%	1 10%	10	2 22%	7 78%	9		Not Applicable
15	The section in the library is not useful.	3 25%	7 58%	2 17%	12	3 30%	7 70%	10		Change
16	Books in the library are too old and not enough.	9 56%	5 31%	2 13%	16	9 64%	5 36%	14	Change	
16	Not enough photocopiers in the library.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13		Not Applicable
Sub totals for Services		51	213	30	294	51	213	264	9	11
% based on number of students		17%	72%	10%		19%	81%		45%	55%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Institution	153	334	62	549	153	334	487	16	19
% based on number of students	28%	61%	11%		31%	69%		46%	54%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Class Dynamics										
21	Not full class participation.	17 81%	4 19%	0 0%	21	17 81%	4 19%	21	No Change	
16	Lack of group participation.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
16	Annoying, argumentative, disruptive, uncompromising students waste valuable time.	11 73%	1 7%	3 20%	15	11 92%	1 8%	12	Change	
17	Classmates distractions during lectures.	13 93%	0 0%	1 7%	14	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
15	Students late.	2 20%	6 60%	2 20%	10	2 25%	6 75%	8	Not Applicable	
34	Continual disruptions from chatterboxes in lectures.	20 67%	8 27%	2 7%	30	20 71%	8 29%	28	Change	
15	Interference during lectures - individuals asking personal questions and taking up time.	4 40%	5 50%	1 10%	10	4 44%	5 56%	9	Change	
17	Class noise too high - 5 people disagree.	12 86%	0 0%	2 14%	14	12 100%	0 0%	12	Change	
Sub totals for Class Dynamics		95	24	11	130	95	24	119	5	3
% based on number of students		73%	18%	8%		80%	20%		63%	38%
Outside Factors										
16	Finding money for course fees, stationery, books, living, food & petrol.	2 13%	8 50%	6 38%	16	2 20%	8 80%	10	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Having to work outside UNITEC to earn money.	1 7%	7 47%	7 47%	15	1 13%	7 88%	8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Sub totals for Outside Factors		3	15	13	31	3	15	18	0	2
% based on number of students		10%	48%	42%		17%	83%		0%	100%
Personal Factors										
17	Lab reports not compulsory and not handed in for feedback - 14 people agree.	5 29%	10 59%	2 12%	17	5 33%	10 67%	15	Change	
16	Own personal motivation.	12 75%	0 0%	4 25%	16	12 100%	0 0%	12	Not Applicable	
16	Personal erratic study habits.	7 47%	3 20%	5 33%	15	7 70%	3 30%	10	Not Applicable	
17	Don't get paid - incentive.	8 57%	3 21%	3 21%	14	8 73%	3 27%	11	Not Applicable	
15	Stress - not being able to keep up with recommended reading.	5 50%	3 30%	2 20%	10	5 63%	3 38%	8	Not Applicable	
15	We aren't trying to speak Japanese as often as we should.	9 75%	2 17%	1 8%	12	9 82%	2 18%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		46	21	17	84	46	21	67	1	5
% based on number of students		55%	25%	20%		69%	31%		17%	83%
Sub totals for Students		144	60	41	245	144	60	204	6	10
% based on number of students		59%	24%	17%		71%	29%		38%	63%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
*** Totals for Hindrance	1042	734	246	2022	1042	734	1776	62	54
% based on number of students	52%	36%	12%		59%	41%		53%	47%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Suggestion										
Lecturer										
Professional Practice										
17	More everyday examples in relation to everyday situations.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
17	Simplify technical handouts.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17		No Change
17	Tutors should know more about the function of videos/slides.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change	
17	Clarify verbally the objectives in the assignments.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
17	Consistency between tutors & classes.	5 38%	5 38%	3 23%	13	5 50%	5 50%	10	Change	Change
20	Have a longer break.	17 85%	3 15%	0 0%	20	17 85%	3 15%	20	Change	
20	More time must be spent on logbook preparation.	7 35%	11 55%	2 10%	20	7 39%	11 61%	18		Change
20	Examples of practical application of business communication in relation to business.	12 60%	8 40%	0 0%	20	12 60%	8 40%	20	Change	
16	More group work to allow for feedback and interaction.	9 56%	7 44%	0 0%	16	9 56%	7 44%	16	Change	
16	More written feedback.	11 73%	2 13%	2 13%	15	11 85%	2 15%	13	Change	
16	Breaks in class - short five minutes to break it up.	3 20%	7 47%	5 33%	15	3 30%	7 70%	10		Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Variations in teaching method.	10 67%	2 13%	3 20%	15	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
21	Field trips or any outside activities (maybe once every three weeks).	2 10%	17 85%	1 5%	20	2 11%	17 89%	19		Not Applicable
16	A short break in the middle of class of 2-5 minutes will improve concentration span.	9 56%	6 38%	1 6%	16	9 60%	6 40%	15	Change	
21	A few brief notes - handouts. More useful brief & effective.	20 95%	1 5%	0 0%	21	20 95%	1 5%	21	Change	
21	More discussion about assignments.	15 71%	6 29%	0 0%	21	15 71%	6 29%	21	Change	
16	Tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments.	9 60%	3 20%	3 20%	15	9 75%	3 25%	12		Not Applicable
21	Depth of research for assignments required to be explained and guidelines to get full marks.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change	
15	More direct feedback - "If it's not right tell me."	7 70%	2 20%	1 10%	10	7 78%	2 22%	9	Change	
17	More interesting lectures - perhaps more experiments, practicals, fun, videos and laser discs, etc.	8 57%	6 43%	0 0%	14	8 57%	6 43%	14	Change	
17	More student input, eg in terms of course design and planning.	7 50%	6 43%	1 7%	14	7 54%	6 46%	13		Not Applicable
15	Tutorials - more structure, time to review process in tutorials "How's it going?". Maybe some tutorials used for working on assignments with tutor assistance.	6 60%	2 20%	2 20%	10	6 75%	2 25%	8	Change	
34	Its our money, our choice, we are adults, treat us accordingly.	19 63%	10 33%	1 3%	30	19 66%	10 34%	29		Not Applicable
34	Only be expected to know things that we have covered.	25 83%	5 17%	0 0%	30	25 83%	5 17%	30	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Ask relaxed questions directed at people so they don't feel threatened. - 1 disagree	11 79%	2 14%	1 7%	14	11 85%	2 15%	13	Change	
16	More visual information from TV news in class.	10 63%	5 31%	1 6%	16	10 67%	5 33%	15	Change	
15	When giving feedback please give constructive criticism as well as encouragement.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
15	Keep on giving us extra homework.	8 67%	3 25%	1 8%	12	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
16	Visit the relevant places to the class, eg companies, the stock exchange, auction, etc.	11 69%	3 19%	2 13%	16	11 79%	3 21%	14	Change	
15	Teachers could speak at normal speed when using vocabulary already taught.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
15	Use more active methods and activities in class - especially Monday mornings.	10 83%	1 8%	1 8%	12	10 91%	1 9%	11	Change	
15	Try to include reviews of material taught earlier in the course.	10 83%	2 17%	0 0%	12	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
15	We need more help with pronunciation - 8 people agree.	9 75%	0 0%	3 25%	12	9 100%	0 0%	9	Change	
16	Concentrate on weak points (students would like a bit more choice over what they study giving them the chance to improve in areas that they feel not good about, eg reading, listening, etc).	8 50%	6 38%	2 13%	16	8 57%	6 43%	14		No Change
Sub totals for Professional Practice		379	139	40	558	379	139	518	25	9
% based on number of students		68%	25%	7%		73%	27%		74%	26%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Lecturer	379	139	40	558	379	139	518	25	9
% based on number of students	68%	25%	7%		73%	27%		74%	26%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Content										
17	More practical work.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
20	More emphasis on computer skills.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20		Change
15	More balance in content - teach both the good & bad aspects of the culture and the people - 11 people agree.	7 38%	4 33%	1 8%	12	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
16	More computer time.	10 63%	2 13%	4 25%	16	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
Sub totals for Content		35	25	5	65	35	25	60	3	1
% based on number of students		54%	38%	8%		58%	42%		75%	25%
Facilities & Services										
17	Hook up printer in SDL area.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	No Change	No Change
17	Computer rooms open in the weekends and paper for printers available.	6 35%	8 47%	3 18%	17	6 43%	8 57%	14		Change
16	More lab time and free labs during the day.	6 40%	3 20%	6 40%	15	6 67%	3 33%	9	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
15	Study area in School for Health.	2 20%	6 60%	2 20%	10	2 25%	6 75%	8		Not Applicable
16	Clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicated brain.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13		Change

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	More time in Learning Centre & Mac Lab.	10 63%	3 19%	3 19%	16	10 77%	3 23%	13	Change	
16	Colour TV & Video in the classroom.	5 31%	6 38%	5 31%	16	5 45%	6 55%	11	No Change	
Sub totals for Facilities & Services		42	42	23	107	42	42	84	2	5
% based on number of students		39%	39%	21%		50%	50%		29%	71%
Materials										
17	Find a more relevant textbook.	4 29%	9 64%	1 7%	14	4 31%	9 69%	13	Not Applicable	
17	More textbooks to be available.	5 33%	10 67%	0 0%	15	5 33%	10 67%	15	Not Applicable	
34	Up to date animal & anatomy videos.	7 23%	13 43%	10 33%	30	7 35%	13 65%	20	Change	
15	Need new resources in the Learning centre - video, tapes, etc.	7 58%	4 33%	1 8%	12	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
15	Have light, humourous, kids books, movies, etc for study periods	9 75%	1 8%	2 17%	12	9 90%	1 10%	10	Change	
Sub totals for Materials		32	37	14	83	32	37	69	2	3
% based on number of students		39%	45%	17%		46%	54%		40%	60%
Organisation										
21	Better organisation of each department - eg handing out assignments.	2 10%	12 57%	7 33%	21	2 14%	12 86%	14	No Change	
16	For full timers - more options as to class time.	2 13%	7 44%	7 44%	16	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Both classes are on last period at end of day - bad time to learn; move to different period.	5 33%	6 40%	4 27%	15	5 45%	6 55%	11	No Change	
16	More class hours - back to 40 hours in class and 20 hours out of class.	4 27%	5 33%	6 40%	15	4 44%	5 56%	9		No Change
16	More convenient timetabling to ensure that we don't have large gaps.	5 33%	5 33%	5 33%	15	5 50%	5 50%	10	No Change	No Change
34	One person marking the the test for consistency of marking	19 63%	6 20%	5 17%	30	19 76%	6 24%	25	Change	
34	Spread assignments more evenly. Re-timetable spread of assignments and tests to give time in between.	14 47%	16 53%	0 0%	30	14 47%	16 53%	30		Change
34	Tell the lecturers the same things as we get told, eg Lecturer B was double booked.	23 77%	3 10%	4 13%	30	23 88%	3 12%	26		Not Applicable
34	Flexible timetable at the beginning of the year to have general idea of what is expected. Course outlined at the beginning of the year.	11 37%	6 20%	13 43%	30	11 65%	6 35%	17		Change
34	Better organisation of course scheduling. Present content in the right order eg anaesthetics too late.	8 27%	17 57%	5 17%	30	8 32%	17 68%	25		Change
17	Split classes over two days, eg one hour per topic a day - 2 disagree.	1 7%	10 71%	3 21%	14	1 9%	10 91%	11	No Change	
17	Longer lunch times - 2 disagree.	1 7%	10 71%	3 21%	14	1 9%	10 91%	11		Not Applicable
17	Resource at the end of the day.	11 69%	4 25%	1 6%	16	11 73%	4 27%	15	Change	
16	More different tutors - concentrate on different skill, eg reading, writing, speaking.	6 38%	4 25%	6 38%	16	6 60%	4 40%	10	Change	Change

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
15	Meet more native speakers so we can understand current cultural thinking & actions.	8 67%	3 25%	1 8%	12	8 73%	3 27%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Organisation		120	114	70	304	120	114	234	6	9
% based on number of students		39%	38%	23%		51%	49%		40%	60%
Sub totals for Department		229	218	112	559	229	218	447	13	18
% based on number of students		41%	39%	20%		51%	49%		42%	58%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	Get the board fixed - too squeaky - minor point.	4 24%	13 76%	0 0%	17	4 24%	13 76%	17	No Change	
20	Air conditioning. - 7 people agree	7 35%	10 50%	3 15%	20	7 41%	10 59%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Move closer to the faculty.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Bigger rooms.	1 5%	19 95%	0 0%	20	1 5%	19 95%	20	No Change	
17	Better parking facilities.	1 8%	12 92%	0 0%	13	1 8%	12 92%	13	Not Applicable	
17	Get water facilities. Don't like drinking in the toilets. Free filtered water, eg bottles.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
17	Improve heating system - hottie & milo. Climatic improvements to rooms.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
20	Desks that are adjustable (the tall people especially felt that the desks were too low).	1 5%	15 75%	4 20%	20	1 6%	15 94%	16	Not Applicable	
17	More rubbish bins and empty ones that are there.	3 23%	9 69%	1 8%	13	3 25%	9 75%	12	Not Applicable	
20	Shift OHP screen.	16 80%	1 5%	3 15%	20	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
17	Outside seating under cover perhaps with picnic tables.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	Not Applicable	
16	To improve the carparking problem extend the area.	4 25%	5 31%	7 44%	16	4 44%	5 56%	9	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Mow on Sundays.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15	No Change	
16	Air conditioner for summer.	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10	Change	
Sub totals for Environment		83	127	28	238	83	127	210	6	8
% based on number of students		35%	53%	12%		40%	60%		43%	57%
Services										
17	We want a cashflow machine on this side of the campus.	1 8%	12 92%	0 0%	13	1 8%	12 92%	13	Not Applicable	
20	Have more food in the cafeteria.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20	Not Applicable	
17	Cafeteria needs better seating and more interesting food selection & prices. Would like coke and not just pepsi.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	No Change	
17	Bring back the non stop shuttle service or improve access to the library.	2 15%	7 54%	4 31%	13	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable	
17	Extend bookshop/resource room hours, ie 8:00pm on campus.	2 15%	11 85%	0 0%	13	2 15%	11 85%	13	Not Applicable	
17	Extension of library and study room hours.	6 35%	11 65%	0 0%	17	6 35%	11 65%	17	No Change	
17	Extend cafe hours early morning till late.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	Change	Change
17	Gym too expensive and needs more facilities.	6 35%	7 41%	4 24%	17	6 46%	7 54%	13	Not Applicable	
17	More photocopy machines	2 12%	15 88%	0 0%	17	2 12%	15 88%	17	No Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
17	Academic environment needs to be supported by more resources.	7 41%	10 59%	0 0%	17	7 41%	10 59%	17	No Change	
17	Better & cheaper food. Better attitude of personnel. Another cafe that is sunny and another operator. Healthier food catering for vegans.	4 24%	11 65%	2 12%	17	4 27%	11 73%	15	No Change	
17	Sky TV in cafe.- 8 people agree	0 0%	9 69%	4 31%	13	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	
17	A bar. Hot toddy for all the colds we have.	2 12%	13 76%	2 12%	17	2 13%	13 87%	15	No Change	
17	Have cash vending machines for changing notes.	1 8%	10 77%	2 15%	13	1 9%	10 91%	11	Not Applicable	
16	Longer library hours - open until 10pm.	1 6%	15 94%	0 0%	16	1 6%	15 94%	16	No Change	
17	More on campus entertainment eg pool tables and decent radio station.	2 14%	12 86%	0 0%	14	2 14%	12 86%	14	Not Applicable	
34	More resources related to this course in library & labs.	11 37%	19 63%	0 0%	30	11 37%	19 63%	30	No Change	
34	Access to phone in blue house (preferably free).	0 0%	23 77%	7 23%	30	0 0%	23 100%	23	No Change	
17	A pub.	0 0%	13 93%	1 7%	14	0 0%	13 100%	13	Not Applicable	
15	Library - noise on door fixed, silent areas monitored, one more photocopier.	4 40%	5 50%	1 10%	10	4 44%	5 56%	9	Not Applicable	
17	Free tea and coffee.	0 0%	14 100%	0 0%	14	0 0%	14 100%	14	Not Applicable	
17	Better cafe food, more variety.	1 7%	11 79%	2 14%	14	1 8%	11 92%	12	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	More photocopiers in the library (there is always a big queue of students).	3 19%	9 56%	4 25%	16	3 25%	9 73%	12		Not Applicable
15	Increase the number and variety of cultural texts in the library.	6 50%	5 42%	1 8%	12	6 55%	5 45%	11	Change	
16	To install more cassette tape recorders in the library.	5 31%	4 25%	7 44%	16	5 56%	4 44%	9		No Change
16	More up-to-date books, magazines, videos, etc in the library & Learning Centre.	6 38%	6 38%	4 25%	16	6 50%	6 50%	12		Not Applicable
16	More Asian food in cafeteria.	6 38%	3 19%	7 44%	16	6 67%	3 33%	9		Change
Sub totals for Services		91	291	53	435	91	291	382	10	17
% based on number of students		21%	67%	12%		24%	76%		37%	63%
Sub totals for Institution		174	418	81	673	174	418	592	16	25
% based on number of students		26%	62%	12%		29%	71%		39%	61%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Class Dynamics										
17	Whole class participation rather than one person answering it all; give us a chance.	13 93%	0 0%	1 7%	14	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change	
Sub totals for Class Dynamics		13	0	1	14	13	0	13	1	0
% based on number of students		93%	0%	7%		100%	0%		100%	0%
Personal Factors										
17	Everyone should get paid equally at the same time.	0 0%	9 64%	5 36%	14	0 0%	9 100%	9	Not Applicable	
15	We need to try to speak more language, eg in the breaks.	9 75%	2 17%	1 8%	12	9 82%	2 18%	11	Change	
16	More free talks with native speakers.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Change	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		15	18	9	42	15	18	33	1	2
% based on number of students		36%	43%	21%		45%	55%		33%	67%
Sub totals for Students		28	18	10	56	28	18	46	2	2
% based on number of students		50%	32%	18%		61%	39%		50%	50%
*** Totals for Suggestion		810	793	243	1846	810	793	1603	56	54
% based on number of students		44%	43%	13%		51%	49%		51%	49%

Appendix E

Report of Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up Where Statements Were Perceived by Majority as Not Applicable

Appendix E: Report of Data Collected from Post-SGID Where Statements Were Perceived by Majority as Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Hindrance										
Department										
Materials										
15	Big words in text book.	3 30%	0 0%	7 70%	10	3 100%	0 0%	3		No Change
15	The textbook explanations are difficult to understand - not detailed enough - 8 people agree.	3 25%	2 17%	7 58%	12	3 60%	2 40%	5		Change
Sub totals for Materials		6	2	14	22	6	2	8	0	2
% based on number of students		27%	9%	64%		75%	25%		0%	100%
Organisation										
15	Long study breaks.	2 20%	1 10%	7 70%	10	2 67%	1 33%	3		No Change
16	Too many students in the class (one person suggested 10 or 12).	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8		Change
Sub totals for Organisation		5	6	15	26	5	6	11	0	2
% based on number of students		19%	23%	58%		45%	55%		0%	100%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Department	11	8	29	48	11	8	19	0	4
% based on number of students	23%	17%	60%		58%	42%		0%	100%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
16	Too hot in the afternoon in the classroom.	3 20%	1 7%	11 73%	15	3 75%	1 25%	4		Change
Sub totals for Environment		3	1	11	15	3	1	4	0	1
% based on number of students		20%	7%	73%		75%	25%		0%	100%
Services										
21	Lateness of shuttle bus, 5 out of 5 people who use it.	2 10%	3 14%	16 76%	21	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
16	Library hours - difficult for shift and full time workers.	0 0%	8 50%	8 50%	16	0 0%	8 100%	8	No Change	No Change
16	Cafeteria food only for Westerners (no Japanese or Korean food). Someone wanted "kimchi".	4 25%	4 25%	8 50%	16	4 50%	4 50%	8		Change
Sub totals for Services		6	15	32	53	6	15	21	1	2
% based on number of students		11%	28%	60%		29%	71%		33%	67%
Sub totals for Institution		9	16	43	68	9	16	25	1	3
% based on number of students		13%	24%	63%		36%	64%		25%	75%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Outside Factors										
16	Other commitments - work, other subjects & sports means lack of personal time.	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8	Not Applicable	
21	The slowness of student services with loans.	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		3	7	27	37	3	7	10	2	0
% based on number of students		8%	19%	73%		30%	70%		100%	0%
Personal Factors										
21	English as a second language.	4 19%	1 5%	16 76%	21	4 80%	1 20%	5	Not Applicable	
16	Own lack of study techniques - ten people.	2 13%	1 6%	13 81%	16	2 67%	1 33%	3	Not Applicable	
15	Personal matters.	5 42%	1 8%	6 50%	12	5 83%	1 17%	6	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		11	3	35	49	11	3	14	3	0
% based on number of students		22%	6%	71%		79%	21%		100%	0%
Sub totals for Students		14	10	62	86	14	10	24	5	0
% based on number of students		16%	12%	72%		58%	42%		100%	0%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
*** Totals for Hindrance	34	34	134	202	34	34	68	6	7
% based on number of students	17%	17%	66%		50%	50%		46%	54%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Suggestion										
Department										
Organisation										
16	Orientation time - more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading, etc.	2 13%	3 19%	11 69%	16	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
34	At interviews and in course brochure be more specific about subjects we cover outside clinics - costs, etc.	0 0%	0 0%	30 100%	30	0 #Num!	0 #Num!	0	Not Applicable	
34	Syllabus handed out at the beginning of the year.	4 13%	1 3%	25 83%	30	4 80%	1 20%	5	Not Applicable	
34	Expand the length of course, eg Jan to Dec. - 26 people agree	0 0%	0 0%	30 100%	30	0 #Num!	0 #Num!	0	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Organisation		6	4	96	106	6	4	10	4	0
% based on number of students		6%	4%	91%		60%	40%		100%	0%
Sub totals for Department		6	4	96	106	6	4	10	4	0
% based on number of students		6%	4%	91%		60%	40%		100%	0%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	Designated smoking areas outside.- 10 people agree	0 0%	6 46%	7 54%	13	0 0%	6 100%	6	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Environment		0	6	7	13	0	6	6	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	46%	54%		0%	100%		100%	0%
Sub totals for Institution		0	6	7	13	0	6	6	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	46%	54%		0%	100%		100%	0%
Students										
Outside Factors										
21	More efficiency at student services - quicker with loans	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		0	2	19	21	0	2	2	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	10%	90%		0%	100%		100%	0%
Sub totals for Students		0	2	19	21	0	2	2	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	10%	90%		0%	100%		100%	0%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
*** Totals for Suggestion	6	12	122	140	6	12	18	6	0
% based on number of students	4%	9%	87%		33%	67%		100%	0%

Appendix F

Report of Data Collected from post-SGID Follow Up After Attrition

Appendix F: Report of Data Collected from Post-SGID Follow Up After Attrition

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Hindrance									
Lecturer									
Professional Practice									
17	More practical hands-on/every day examples.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change
17	Poor usage of switch system - light, video, TV.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change
17	Not enough explanation of terminology.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change
21	Not enough time to write down points from discussions (13 agree).	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change
21	Self reliance in learning from learning objectives.	15 71%	5 24%	1 5%	21	15 75%	5 25%	20	Change
21	Lack of "brief notes". No notes from class.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change
16	Too much homework - 11 people agree.	13 81%	0 0%	3 19%	16	13 100%	0 0%	13	Change
Sub totals for Professional Practice		105	19	6	130	105	19	124	7 0
% based on number of students		81%	15%	5%		85%	15%		100% 0%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Lecturer	105	19	6	130	105	19	124	7	0
% based on number of students	81%	15%	5%		85%	15%		100%	0%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Assessment										
16	Too much assessment.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
Sub totals for Assessment		7	4	5	16	7	4	11	1	0
% based on number of students		44%	25%	31%		64%	36%		100%	0%
Content										
17	Some data is too technical, eg graphs.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
Sub totals for Content		17	0	0	17	17	0	17	0	1
% based on number of students		100%	0%	0%		100%	0%		0%	100%
Facilities & Services										
17	Self directed computers are not always connected to the printer.	5 29%	9 53%	3 18%	17	5 36%	9 64%	14	No Change	
16	Noisy in the learning centre - crowded.	8 50%	4 25%	4 25%	16	8 67%	4 33%	12	No Change	
16	Learning Centre drop-in time is not enough.	7 44%	4 25%	5 31%	16	7 64%	4 36%	11	Change	
16	Open hours of the Computer Lab is not enough.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
	Sub totals for Facilities & Services	27	25	13	65	27	25	52	2	2
	% based on number of students	42%	38%	20%		52%	48%		50%	50%
Materials										
17	Under resourced.	10 59%	6 35%	1 6%	17	10 63%	6 38%	16		No Change
	Sub totals for Materials	10	6	1	17	10	6	16	0	1
	% based on number of students	59%	35%	6%		63%	38%		0%	100%
Organisation										
17	More tutoring required during lab sessions.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
20	Not enough time in computer room.	2 10%	14 70%	4 20%	20	2 13%	14 88%	16		Change
17	Technicians need to be introduced regularly.	12 71%	4 24%	1 6%	17	12 75%	4 25%	16	Change	
16	Course too concentrated for time span.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13		Not Applicable
21	Assignments across courses all handed out at once.	5 24%	16 76%	0 0%	21	5 24%	16 76%	21	No Change	
16	Course fee too expensive. (Why has it been raised so much from the previous semester?)	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10		Not Applicable
16	Too many students in the class (one person suggested 10 or 12).	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8		Change

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Organisation	46	55	22	123	46	55	101	3	4
% based on number of students	37%	45%	18%		46%	54%		43%	57%
Sub totals for Department	107	90	41	238	107	90	197	6	8
% based on number of students	45%	38%	17%		54%	46%		43%	57%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
20	Not enough parking.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17		Not Applicable
17	Lack of heating. Cold. Icicles hanging off the visual aids. Uncomfortable learning environment.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
17	No taps for drinking water.	0 0%	17 100%	0 0%	17	0 0%	17 100%	17	No Change	
20	Chairs and desks are uncomfortable (not everyone agrees).	0 0%	13 65%	7 35%	20	0 0%	13 100%	13		Not Applicable
20	Too far from faculty.	2 10%	12 60%	6 30%	20	2 14%	12 86%	14		Not Applicable
20	OHP screen in awkward place for some students.	15 75%	0 0%	5 25%	20	15 100%	0 0%	15	Change	
20	The classroom: too small, stuffy and not enough seats for combined classes.	1 5%	18 90%	1 5%	20	1 5%	18 95%	19		Change
21	Outside distractions, eg car alarms, lawnmower, cell phones.	11 52%	9 43%	1 5%	21	11 55%	9 45%	20	Change	
16	The room lighting - the sun's reflection.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
16	Noisy, eg lawnmowing during the day, especially Monday mornings, make it difficult to study.	6 38%	10 63%	0 0%	16	6 38%	10 63%	16	No Change	
16	Too hot in the afternoon in the classroom.	3 20%	1 7%	11 73%	15	3 75%	1 25%	4		Change
16	Not enough carpark spaces.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13		Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Environment		76	105	37	218	76	105	181	6	6
% based on number of students		35%	48%	17%		42%	58%		50%	50%
Services										
20	Not enough variety of food in the cafeteria and often by 12.30 there is not any left.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20	Not Applicable	
17	Restricted availability of required texts. Texts not available at beginning of course.	6 35%	9 53%	2 12%	17	6 40%	9 60%	15	Not Applicable	
17	Reading room hours too few. Lack of books and information in resource and reading room.	3 18%	14 82%	0 0%	17	3 18%	14 82%	17	No Change	
17	Need more food at cafe and better food.	2 12%	14 82%	1 6%	17	2 13%	14 88%	16	No Change	
16	Library hours - difficult for shift and full time workers.	0 0%	8 50%	8 50%	16	0 0%	8 100%	8	No Change	No Change
21	Lateness of shuttle bus, 5 out of 5 people who use it.	2 10%	3 14%	16 76%	21	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
16	Cafeteria food only for Westerners (no Japanese or Korean food). Someone wanted "kimchi".	4 25%	4 25%	8 50%	16	4 50%	4 50%	8	Change	
16	Books in the library are too old and not enough.	9 56%	5 31%	2 13%	16	9 64%	5 36%	14	Change	
16	Not enough photocopiers in the library.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Services		35	81	40	156	35	81	116	4	5
% based on number of students		22%	52%	26%		30%	70%		44%	56%

Original No. in SGID	Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
	Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Institution	111	186	77	374	111	186	297	10	11
% based on number of students	30%	50%	21%		37%	63%		48%	52%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Class Dynamics										
16	Lack of group participation.	16 100%	0 0%	0 0%	16	16 100%	0 0%	16	Change	
21	Not full class participation.	17 81%	4 19%	0 0%	21	17 81%	4 19%	21	No Change	
Sub totals for Class Dynamics		33	4	0	37	33	4	37	1	1
% based on number of students		89%	11%	0%		89%	11%		50%	50%
Outside Factors										
16	Other commitments - work, other subjects & sports means lack of personal time.	3 19%	5 31%	8 50%	16	3 38%	5 63%	8	Not Applicable	
21	The slowness of student services with loans.	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	
16	Finding money for course fees, stationery, books, living, food & petrol.	2 13%	8 50%	6 38%	16	2 20%	8 80%	10	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		5	15	33	53	5	15	20	2	1
% based on number of students		9%	28%	62%		25%	75%		67%	33%
Personal Factors										
17	Lab reports not compulsory and not handed in for feedback - 14 people agree.	5 29%	10 59%	2 12%	17	5 33%	10 67%	15	Change	
16	Own lack of study techniques - ten people.	2 13%	1 6%	13 81%	16	2 67%	1 33%	3	Not Applicable	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	Own personal motivation.	12 75%	0 0%	4 25%	16	12 100%	0 0%	12	Not Applicable	
21	English as a second language.	4 19%	1 5%	16 76%	21	4 80%	1 20%	5	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		23	12	35	70	23	12	35	2	2
% based on number of students		33%	17%	50%		66%	34%		50%	50%
Sub totals for Students		61	31	68	160	61	31	92	5	4
% based on number of students		38%	19%	43%		66%	34%		56%	44%
*** Totals for Hindrance		384	326	192	902	384	326	710	28	23
% based on number of students		43%	36%	21%		54%	46%		55%	45%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Suggestion										
Lecturer										
Professional Practice										
17	Simplify technical handouts.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17		No Change
17	More everyday examples in relation to everyday situations.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
20	More time must be spent on logbook preparation.	7 35%	11 55%	2 10%	20	7 39%	11 61%	18		Change
17	Clarify verbally the objectives in the assignments.	15 88%	1 6%	1 6%	17	15 94%	1 6%	16	Change	
20	Examples of practical application of business communication in relation to business.	12 60%	8 40%	0 0%	20	12 60%	8 40%	20	Change	
17	Tutors should know more about the function of videos/slides.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	Change	
20	Have a longer break.	17 85%	3 15%	0 0%	20	17 85%	3 15%	20	Change	
21	A few brief notes - handouts. More useful brief & effective.	20 95%	1 5%	0 0%	21	20 95%	1 5%	21	Change	
21	Depth of research for assignments required to be explained and guidelines to get full marks.	19 90%	2 10%	0 0%	21	19 90%	2 10%	21	Change	
21	Field trips or any outside activities (maybe once every three weeks).	2 10%	17 85%	1 5%	20	2 11%	17 89%	19		Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
21	More discussion about assignments.	15 71%	6 29%	0 0%	21	15 71%	6 29%	21	Change	
16	More group work to allow for feedback and interaction.	9 56%	7 44%	0 0%	16	9 56%	7 44%	16	Change	
16	A short break in the middle of class of 2-5 minutes will improve concentration span.	9 56%	6 38%	1 6%	16	9 60%	6 40%	15	Change	
16	Visit the relevant places to the class, eg companies, the stock exchange, auction, etc.	11 69%	3 19%	2 13%	16	11 79%	3 21%	14	Change	
16	Concentrate on weak points (students would like a bit more choice over what they study giving them the chance to improve in areas that they feel not good about, eg reading, listening, etc).	8 50%	6 38%	2 13%	16	8 57%	6 43%	14		No Change
16	More visual information from TV news in class.	10 63%	5 31%	1 6%	16	10 67%	5 33%	15	Change	
Sub totals for Professional Practice		201	79	11	291	201	79	280	12	4
% based on number of students		69%	27%	4%		72%	28%		75%	25%
Sub totals for Lecturer		201	79	11	291	201	79	280	12	4
% based on number of students		69%	27%	4%		72%	28%		75%	25%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Department										
Content										
17	More practical work.	15 88%	2 12%	0 0%	17	15 88%	2 12%	17	Change	
20	More emphasis on computer skills.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20		Change
16	More computer time.	10 63%	2 13%	4 25%	16	10 83%	2 17%	12	Change	
Sub totals for Content		28	21	4	53	28	21	49	2	1
% based on number of students		53%	40%	8%		57%	43%		67%	33%
Facilities & Services										
17	Computer rooms open in the weekends and paper for printers available.	6 35%	8 47%	3 18%	17	6 43%	8 57%	14		Change
17	Hook up printer in SDL area.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	No Change	No Change
16	More time in Learning Centre & Mac Lab.	10 63%	3 19%	3 19%	16	10 77%	3 23%	13	Change	
16	Clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicated brain.	5 31%	8 50%	3 19%	16	5 38%	8 62%	13		Change
16	Colour TV & Video in the classroom.	5 31%	6 38%	5 31%	16	5 45%	6 55%	11	No Change	
Sub totals for Facilities & Services		34	33	15	82	34	33	67	2	3
% based on number of students		41%	40%	18%		51%	49%		40%	60%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Organisation										
16	Orientation time - more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading, etc.	2 13%	3 19%	11 69%	16	2 40%	3 60%	5	Not Applicable	
21	Better organisation of each department - eg handing out assignments.	2 10%	12 57%	7 33%	21	2 14%	12 86%	14	No Change	
16	For full timers - more options as to class time.	2 13%	7 44%	7 44%	16	2 22%	7 78%	9	Not Applicable Not Applicable	
16	More different tutors - concentrate on different skill, eg reading, writing, speaking.	6 38%	4 25%	6 38%	16	6 60%	4 40%	10	Change	Change
Sub totals for Organisation		12	26	31	69	12	26	38	2	2
% based on number of students		17%	38%	45%		32%	68%		50%	50%
Sub totals for Department		74	80	50	204	74	80	154	6	6
% based on number of students		36%	39%	25%		48%	52%		50%	50%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Institution										
Environment										
17	Get water facilities. Don't like drinking in the toilets. Free filtered water, eg bottles.	17 100%	0 0%	0 0%	17	17 100%	0 0%	17	No Change	
20	Move closer to the faculty.	1 5%	16 80%	3 15%	20	1 6%	16 94%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Bigger rooms.	1 5%	19 95%	0 0%	20	1 5%	19 95%	20	No Change	
17	Get the board fixed - too squeaky - minor point.	4 24%	13 76%	0 0%	17	4 24%	13 76%	17	No Change	
20	Shift OHP screen.	16 80%	1 5%	3 15%	20	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
17	Improve heating system - hottie & milo. Climatic improvements to rooms.	16 94%	1 6%	0 0%	17	16 94%	1 6%	17	Change	
20	Air conditioning. - 7 people agree	7 35%	10 50%	3 15%	20	7 41%	10 59%	17	Not Applicable	
20	Desks that are adjustable (the tall people especially felt that the desks were too low).	1 5%	15 75%	4 20%	20	1 6%	15 94%	16	Not Applicable	
16	To improve the carparking problem extend the area.	4 25%	5 31%	7 44%	16	4 44%	5 56%	9	Not Applicable	
16	Mow on Sundays.	7 44%	8 50%	1 6%	16	7 47%	8 53%	15	No Change	
16	Air conditioner for summer.	3 19%	7 44%	6 38%	16	3 30%	7 70%	10	Change	

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Sub totals for Environment		77	95	27	199	77	95	172	6	5
% based on number of students		39%	48%	14%		45%	55%		55%	45%
Services										
17	A bar. Hot toddy for all the colds we have.	2 12%	13 76%	2 12%	17	2 13%	13 87%	15	No Change	
17	Gym too expensive and needs more facilities.	6 35%	7 41%	4 24%	17	6 46%	7 54%	13		Not Applicable
17	More photocopy machines	2 12%	15 88%	0 0%	17	2 12%	15 88%	17	No Change	
20	Have more food in the cafeteria.	3 15%	17 85%	0 0%	20	3 15%	17 85%	20		Not Applicable
17	Academic environment needs to be supported by more resources.	7 41%	10 59%	0 0%	17	7 41%	10 59%	17	No Change	
17	Extension of library and study room hours.	6 35%	11 65%	0 0%	17	6 35%	11 65%	17	No Change	
17	Better & cheaper food. Better attitude of personnel. Another cafe that is sunny and another operator. Healthier food catering for vegans.	4 24%	11 65%	2 12%	17	4 27%	11 73%	15	No Change	
17	Extend cafe hours early morning till late.	8 47%	8 47%	1 6%	17	8 50%	8 50%	16	Change	Change
16	Longer library hours - open until 10pm.	1 6%	15 94%	0 0%	16	1 6%	15 94%	16	No Change	
16	More up-to-date books, magazines, videos, etc in the library & Learning Centre.	6 38%	6 38%	4 25%	16	6 50%	6 50%	12		Not Applicable
16	More photocopiers in the library (there is always a big queue of students).	3 19%	9 56%	4 25%	16	3 25%	9 75%	12		Not Applicable

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
16	More Asian food in cafeteria.	6 38%	3 19%	7 44%	16	6 67%	3 33%	9		Change
16	To install more cassette tape recorders in the library.	5 31%	4 25%	7 44%	16	5 56%	4 44%	9		No Change
Sub totals for Services		59	129	31	219	59	129	188	6	7
% based on number of students		27%	59%	14%		31%	69%		46%	54%
Sub totals for Institution		136	224	58	418	136	224	360	12	12
% based on number of students		33%	54%	14%		38%	62%		50%	50%

Original No. in SGID		Change Responses				Without "Not Applicables"			Lecturer Agreement	
		Change	No change	NA	No.	Change	No change	No.	Yes	No
Students										
Outside Factors										
21	More efficiency at student services - quicker with loans	0 0%	2 10%	19 90%	21	0 0%	2 100%	2	Not Applicable	
Sub totals for Outside Factors		0	2	19	21	0	2	2	1	0
% based on number of students		0%	10%	90%		0%	100%		100%	0%
Personal Factors										
16	More free talks with native speakers.	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16	6 46%	7 54%	13	Change	
Sub totals for Personal Factors		6	7	3	16	6	7	13	0	1
% based on number of students		38%	44%	19%		46%	54%		0%	100%
Sub totals for Students		6	9	22	37	6	9	15	1	1
% based on number of students		16%	24%	59%		40%	60%		50%	50%
*** Totals for Suggestion		417	392	141	950	417	392	809	31	23
% based on number of students		44%	41%	15%		52%	48%		57%	43%

Appendix G

Interview Statements (Question F) & SGID Comments

Appendix G: Interview Statements (Question F) & SGID Comments

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Lecturer			
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I have been more aware of the one-to-one interaction with dominant students and feel more confident to intervene now.	Tutor needs to control to dissolve meaningless arguments.
Professional Practice	Hindrance	More examples have now been given.	More practical hands-on/every day examples.
Professional Practice	Suggestion		More everyday examples in relation to everyday situations.
Professional Practice	Hindrance	I have gained expertise here.	Poor usage of switch system - light, video, TV.
Professional Practice	Suggestion		Tutors should know more about the function of videos/slides.
Professional Practice	Hindrance	I have asked students to intervene if they do not understand the terminology.	Not enough explanation of terminology.
Professional Practice	Suggestion		Simplify technical handouts.
Professional Practice	Hindrance		Consistency of tutors in what they say and do, eg down marking for late assignments.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	This could be overcome with greater planning and structure.	Consistency between tutors & classes.
Professional Practice	Hindrance		Lack of "brief notes". No notes from class.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I have endeavoured to give clearer outlines.	A few brief notes - handouts. More useful brief & effective.
Professional Practice	Hindrance		Monotonous teaching methods, same method all the time, too much lecturer talk.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	A greater variety in teacher lecture methods happening. The first part of the course was heavily lecture.	Variations in teaching method.
Professional Practice	Hindrance		Inadequate written feedback.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	More written feedback is provided to students on tests and assignments.	More written feedback.
Professional Practice	Hindrance	I have endeavoured to direct attention to the objectives in the textbook more often.	Self reliance in learning from learning objectives.
Professional Practice	Hindrance	Keeping them posted as to what is happening well in advance.	Lack of information for assignments - format, possible resources, due dates - indecisive and inconsistent.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	We are doing more activities on Monday mornings.	Use more active methods and activities in class - especially Monday mornings.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I have taken time in class to deal with this.	More time must be spent on logbook preparation.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	Generally, lecturers are speaking more Japanese in class.	Teachers could speak at normal speed when using vocabulary already taught.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	We have been intending to do a visit and the SGID has made us schedule time to organise it.	Visit the relevant places to the class, eg companies, the stock exchange, auction, etc.

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Professional Practice	Suggestion	We have reached a class consensus about how long for a break.	Have a longer break.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I am trying to develop these.	Tutorials - more structure, time to review process in tutorials "How's it going?". Maybe some tutorials used for working on assignments with tutor assistance.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I thought I had spent lots of time on what was required but obviously I needed to do more so I put more time in to this.	Depth of research for assignments required to be explained and guidelines to get full marks.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I made an offer but interest seems to have died as I have had no takers.	Field trips or any outside activities (maybe once every three weeks).
Professional Practice	Suggestion	I introduced short breaks.	A short break in the middle of class of 2-5 minutes will improve concentration span.
Professional Practice	Suggestion	Introduced more group work	More group work to allow for feedback and interaction.

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Department			
Organisation	Hindrance		Not enough time in computer room.
Content	Suggestion	Procedure was outlined to students and the course design will be taken on board by the Department and acted upon.	More emphasis on computer skills.
Facilities & Services	Hindrance		Learning Centre drop-in time is not enough.
Facilities & Services	Suggestion	This has been passed on to the Department.	More time in Learning Centre & Mac Lab.
Organisation	Hindrance		Assignments across courses all handed out at once.
Organisation	Suggestion	I have passed on information about Department issues but have not heard anything back yet.	Better organisation of each department - eg handing out assignments.
Organisation	Hindrance		Classes are too long and infrequent, eg physics once a week (2 disagree).
Organisation	Suggestion	Need to organise things differently in the future.	Split classes over two days, eg one hour per topic a day - 2 disagree.
Organisation	Hindrance		Resources at wrong time of day; have at end of day.
Organisation	Suggestion	Has raised my awareness of this.	Resource at the end of the day.
Organisation	Hindrance	More pair work involved now.	Students are at different stages, the more advanced feel the learning is too slow, the beginners find it hard.
Organisation	Hindrance	The timetable is now given to them as they wanted it.	Changes of timetable when uninformed and at the last minute is bad. Timetable muck ups. Inadequate notice of changes.
Organisation	Hindrance	I have passed the information on and there has been some change.	More tutoring required during lab sessions.
Content	Hindrance	Nothing much can be done except we are searching for interactional disks that can be used for our courses.	Things in the syllabus that we don't need to know but have to learn, eg stationary anode tubes.
Materials	Suggestion	We have looked at extra resources to be made available and I have encouraged use of the Library and bringing their own resources to share.	Need new resources in the Learning centre - video, tapes, etc.
Facilities & Services	Suggestion	We have used videos in the classroom since SGID.	Colour TV & Video in the classroom.
Organisation	Suggestion	We have responded as a department to different timetable arrangements as requested by students.	Both classes are on last period at end of day - bad time to learn; move to different period.
Organisation	Suggestion	Orientation - more information about the course was included in the fliers, eg texts, required reading. More option times thought about. All this information passed on to co-ordinator.	Orientation time - more information in fliers about the course to tell us about texts, required reading, etc.
Organisation	Suggestion	I gave the brochure to the students to add there comments but I have not got any back. I think the students just feel happier that they have got some points off their chests.	At interviews and in course brochure be more specific about subjects we cover outside clinics - costs, etc.

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Organisation	Suggestion	One tutor marking all the tests and assignments; I had some difficulty with this and have explained why to students.	One person marking the the test for consistency of marking
Facilities & Services	Suggestion	The students have been invited to bring along their own equipment if they wish.	Clean water and electric kettle to refresh your complicated brain.

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Institution			
Environment	Hindrance		OHP screen in awkward place for some students.
Environment	Suggestion	The OHP is now in a better place.	Shift OHP screen.
Environment	Hindrance		Too far from faculty.
Environment	Suggestion	This has been placed on the Department agenda.	Move closer to the faculty.
Environment	Hindrance	This has improved, but not directly because of SGID.	Lack of heating. Cold. Icicles hanging off the visual aids. Uncomfortable learning environment.
Environment	Suggestion		Improve heating system - hottie & milo. Climatic improvements to rooms.
Services	Hindrance		Not enough variety of food in the cafeteria and often by 12.30 there is not any left.
Services	Suggestion	A letter was recieved from the Manager of the Cafeteria.	Have more food in the cafeteria.
Services	Hindrance	We recieved a letter from the cafeteria.	Need more food at cafe and better food.
Services	Suggestion		Better & cheaper food. Better attitude of personnel. Another cafe that is sunny and another operator. Healthier food catering for vegans.
Services	Hindrance	I have talked to the Library manager and they will be extending the Library hours.	Reading room hours too few. Lack of books and information in resource and reading room.
Services	Suggestion		Extension of library and study room hours.
Services	Hindrance		Library hours - difficult for shift and full time workers.
Services	Suggestion	Passed to the library but nothing has happened as yet.	Longer library hours - open until 10pm.
Services	Suggestion	This information was passed on to the library and they sent a memo in response.	Library - noise on door fixed, silent areas monitored, one more photocopier.
Services	Hindrance		Cafe food sux and is too expensive.
Services	Suggestion	We recieved a letter from the cafeteria in response to the student comments.	Better cafe food, more variety.
Services	Hindrance		Not enough photocopiers in the library.
Services	Suggestion	We sent a memo to the Library but we have not heard back yet.	More photocopiers in the library (there is always a big queue of students).
Services	Hindrance		Books in the library are too old and not enough.
Services	Suggestion	This information has been passed on to the Learning Centre.	More up-to-date books, magazines, videos, etc in the library & Learning Centre.
Services	Hindrance		Cafeteria food only for Westerners (no Japanese or Korean food). Someone wanted "kimchi".

Sub Group		Interview Statement	SGID Comment
Services	Suggestion	The cafeteria manager came and spoke to the students.	More Asian food in cafeteria.
Services	Hindrance		The section in the library is not useful.
Services	Suggestion	I have been proactive here and given a book list of texts to the Library.	Increase the number and variety of cultural texts in the library.
Environment	Hindrance	The heating has improved but not because of SGID.	Lack of heating.
Services	Hindrance	I passed the information on to the Library Manager who was already aware of this.	Library inadequate in the Arch & Dsgn building with limited resource materials; this is a big one for us. Limited access to library services and facilities.
Environment	Hindrance	These are Institutional issues and I do not know what has happened with them.	Difficult to find rooms.
Students			
Class Dynamics	Hindrance		Annoying, argumentative, disruptive, uncompromising students waste valuable time.
Personal Factors	Hindrance		We aren't trying to speak Japanese as often as we should.
Personal Factors	Suggestion	The students have tried hard to use their Japanese, I have noticed.	We need to try to speak more language, eg in the breaks.
Class Dynamics	Hindrance	Class room control is there baby.	Continual disruptions from chatterboxes in lectures.