

Research Space

Journal article

Students as partners in learning and teaching: Assessing the effectiveness of student evaluation of teaching

Sah, R.

Students as Partners in Learning and Teaching: Assessing the Effectiveness of Student Evaluation of Teaching

Rajeeb Kumar Sah¹

1. Faculty of Medicine, Health and Social Care, Canterbury Christ Church University, North Holmes Road, Canterbury CT1 1QU United Kingdom, rajeeb.sah@canterbury.ac.uk

Biography

Dr Rajeeb Kumar Sah is a Senior Lecturer in Public Health, Programme Director for MSc Global Public Health and International Lead for School of Allied and Public Health Professions. He is the Fellow of Higher Education Academy. Dr Sah is a medical doctor and has completed MSc Public Health from Queen Mary, University of London and PhD from Canterbury Christ Church University. His PhD examined social and cultural factors affecting sexual lifestyles and relationships of young people. He is interested in international and intercultural aspects of health and education promoting academic practice, inclusive curriculum, sustainability in education and student-staff partnership in higher education. His wider research interests include young people and social changes, sexual health, lifestyles and relationships, migrant health, social inclusion, global health inequalities, internationalisation in higher education, ethnography, grounded theory and intersectionality.

Abstract

Students engagement in learning and teaching is necessary to enhance academic practices which provides mechanism to support the development and enhancement of learners and teachers' partnerships. In the rapidly changing world, Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) could provide an opportunity to coproduce and develop effective teaching and learning strategy for sustainable education in universities. Most higher education providers in the UK has adopted SET, as it measures the effectiveness of teaching and learning and provides guide for changes in the course materials, methods of delivery and assessment procedures, to enhance students experience and engagement. However, poorly designed questionnaires and inability to reflect students' perceptions and expectations in the SET fails to fulfil the real purpose. This action research used a revised SET questionnaire based on the discussions with the lecturers and the students within a university setting to understand their expectations and engagement in completing the questionnaires. Although the consensus was to use SET to evaluate and improve teaching and learning to enhance the quality of the course, the students raised concerns about the feedback loop and implementation of the feedback received through SET. This was believed to be the barrier in motivating students to fully participate in the process of evaluation. The open and transparent discussions with students about the evaluation process and the importance of students as partners in learning and teaching and including SET as part of the lesson plan allowed teachers to promote engagement of students in this evaluation process.

Keywords

Partners in learning; Student evaluation of teaching; higher education; action research; teaching and learning

Students as Partners in Learning and Teaching: Assessing the Effectiveness of Student Evaluation of Teaching

Introduction

‘Students as partners in learning’ is becoming an increasingly important principle of teaching and learning strategy within the universities in the United Kingdom (UK). The principle highlights the value of student and staff partnerships in creating inclusive curriculum and delivering high quality education and outcomes. Student evaluation of teaching (SET) is a normal routine process across the UK higher education and is one of the major ways towards strengthening student-staff partnership where students are provided with an opportunity to evaluate the course contents and the teaching on the course as well as their engagement and dedication towards the course (Rowley, 2003). The introduction of higher tuition fees within the UK higher education has increasingly created a notion of students as consumers (Streeting and Wise, 2009), where consumerism attitudes have contributed towards expectations among these groups that they deserve higher grades and better experiences to achieve customer satisfaction. An appropriate SET would provide information about students’ satisfaction levels in the context of the learning on the course, and these feedbacks can be used to further improve the quality of teaching and learning within the higher education settings (Wong and Moni, 2014).

The participation of students in teaching and learning is essential towards building partnership, reflecting their perceptions about the course and teaching as well as towards enhancing their learning experiences. In this context, the aim of this research is to strengthen students’ partnership in teaching and learning using ‘Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)’. This study applies action research methodology to achieve this by engaging with students and lecturers to understand the expectations from SET, which allows the author to prepare a revised SET questionnaire to reflect these expectations. It was found that students were more likely to engage with the module evaluation questionnaire that were simple, clear, non-repetitive and short. Students highlighted that it was important for them to be partners in learning and therefore expected to be informed about the whole process of SET and how they would benefit from the process. The study asserts the need for SET to be an interactive process with students as partners in learning to enhance their teaching and learning experience rather than merely an administrative process.

Students as partners in learning

Students as partners in learning and teaching is one of the key agenda implemented by most of the universities in the UK. Students through representation, engagement and partnership play an important role in improving students experience and delivering excellent education and outcomes (CCCU, 2015-20). Students as partners in teaching and learning is a process through which students engage with academics, professional services, senior managers, students' unions and other stakeholders to integrate their voices in the process of learning to improve and enhance student experiences at the university (Healey, Flint and Harrington, 2014). The framework for student engagement through partnership provides mechanism to support the development and enhancement of the partnerships, which is important for student learning, staff engagement, transformation and sustainability in the higher education (HEA, 2015). However, this partnership is often seen as immature and raises various concerns since students are perceived as neither disciplined nor experienced in sustaining these partnerships (Healey, Flint and Harrington, 2014). Additionally, students, staffs and senior management teams have different motivations and expectations for engaging in partnerships, which give rise to tensions around differentials in power, recognition of participation, identity and responsibility for partnership working (Fraser and Hack, 2015). Moreover, the UK higher education is being developed by using the market approaches where students are paying higher fees and there are worries over the 'value for money', which is increasingly creating a notion of the student 'as consumer' (Streeting and Wise, 2009). Students in the UK are increasingly seeing themselves as a customer than a learner and the consumerism attitudes and behaviour of students in relations to the higher education set their expectations towards receiving higher grades to achieve customer satisfaction however, it makes them to search for their learners' identity which limits their engagement in teaching and learning leading to lower academic performances, since higher consumer orientation is associated with lower academic performances (Bunce, Baird and Jones, 2016). The partnership between students as 'customers' and institutions as 'service providers' are presented with multiple barriers because of their conflicting interests and expectations within the partnerships and lack of clear understandings towards a common agreed goal. This results in limiting the teaching and learning experiences for students in higher education.

McCulloch (2009) argues that 'students as consumer' signifies partial understanding and does not fit to the realities of contemporary higher education. Students should be seen as 'co-producers' where students, lecturers and other stakeholders involved in teaching and

learning process are seen as being engaged in a cooperative enterprise focussed on the production, dissemination and application of knowledge towards the development of learners rather than a skilled technicians (McCulloch, 2009). Students engagement and partnership is essential towards the production of knowledge and students should not be treated as passive recipients of the service. As co-producers in learning and teaching, students have shared responsibilities for identifying the problem or opportunity for improvement and play key role in addressing the issues with co-delivery of the solution. This could bring numerous benefits to all the stakeholders involved, which includes increased satisfaction amongst learners and academic staff, reduced student anxiety, greater understanding of learner needs, improved teaching and learning experiences as well as improved educational outcomes (Streeting and Wise, 2009). It is important for learners and staffs to develop a sense of community and belonging as well as align themselves with their personal beliefs and values about learning and teaching to design and deliver to the agreed goal of improving student learning experience and educational outcomes. This needs to be achieved through engagement offering constructive alternative to the consumerist models of higher education. The coproduction and development of inclusive curriculum with regular communication between the partners to achieve the agreed shared goals based on the values of openness, trust and honesty will enhance the partnership and develop mature relationship with mutual respect between students and staffs.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Student evaluations of teaching (SET) are integral part for the development of effective teaching and learning strategy in the UK higher education. SET is considered as an important evaluation process as it measures the effectiveness of teachers as well as provides guide for potential changes in course materials, methods of delivery and assessment procedures (Shevlin et al., 2000). SET is used as a measure for students' attainment of learning outcomes, effectiveness of teaching as well as partnership in improving and designing curriculum (Denson, Loveday and Dalton, 2010). Rowley (2003) describes SET as one of the important components for quality assessment. However, Kember, Leung and Kwan (2002) assert that there is little or no evidence that shows the use of evaluation questionnaire contribute towards improving the quality of teaching or students learning experiences, at least this is what is perceived by students (Blair and Noel, 2014). Malouff and colleagues (2015)

suggests that SET is a useful resource in revising the instructional pedagogy (Huybers, 2014), if conducted systematically and effectively. SET remains a keenly debated issue and yet is one of the most prevalent practices in the higher education to evaluate teaching performances (Catano and Harvey, 2011; Surgenor, 2013).

Given the significant importance of SET, there is a genuine concern about whether the information collected as result of evaluation has the potential to be used for the wider purposes. The validity of SET information is often debatable, since the evaluation of courses is based on student perceptions of clarity, quality and ability (Spooren, Brockx and Mortelmans, 2013; Surgenor, 2013; Blair and Noel, 2014; Reisenwitz, 2016). It is assumed that the students are more likely to complete the questionnaires positively if they had a positive personal and/or social view about the lecturer, which may not correspond to the actual level of teaching effectiveness (Shevlin et al., 2000). Zabaleta (2007) describes that student evaluations show complex relationships between students and teachers and asserts that the components of this relationships remain unclear. SET can be influenced by various factors other than teaching ability or course design such as student characteristics, subject area, level of course or the physical environment (Rowley, 2003; Fah and Osman, 2011; Surgenor, 2013). Although students' feedback provides rich insight on the effectiveness of the course and teaching (Blair and Noel, 2014), validity and reliability of SET are highly complex and controversial with contradictory findings towards its effectiveness towards teaching and learning (Gursoy and Umbreit, 2005; Spooren, Brockx and Mortelmans, 2013). The findings and interpretation of outcomes of SET plays an important role in determining the reliability and validity of the student evaluations, which then helps to improve students experience and effectiveness of teaching and learning (Boysen, 2016).

However, many of the SETs are ill-designed that does not fulfil the real purpose of this activity and the outcomes does not reflect student's perspectives about the course or the lecturers or teaching/learning (Penny, 2003). The issue of poorly designed questionnaires and inability to reflect students' perceptions and expectations are widespread throughout the universities (Leckey and Neill, 2001). This is because most SETs adopted by faculties are simply developed through expert opinions, which do not necessarily measure the important components relevant to the students within that faculty (Catano and Harvey, 2011). Jackson and colleagues (1999) suggests that the excessive numbers of items on the evaluation sheet and duplication of information collected can become tedious and may influence the real purpose of the SET hindering the effectiveness evaluation process. Moreover, SET only

becomes an effective tool for learning and teaching strategy if the feedback and data received from the students are considered seriously among relevant stakeholders and with an appropriate action plan to enhance students experience and improve the quality of teaching practice (Wong and Moni, 2014).

The changing political and educational landscapes in higher education have raised the demands for the evidence of quality of teaching (Surgenor, 2013). The introduction of higher tuition fees has brought up many challenges for the UK universities and has put students experience at the centre of all strategies. The ambition of making teaching and learning inclusive requires commitments towards engaging with students in such a way that they feel part of it. Alok (2011) explains students are best placed in the classroom to observe the performance of the lecturer and what is being delivered, making SET an important instrument to measure the effectiveness of teaching and learning. There is a need for students to get involved in the development of the SET questionnaire rather than just taking part in the evaluation process (Catano and Harvey, 2011). This would build an inclusive learning environment where both students and tutors are responsible for creating and improving the curriculum. Additionally, there is a need to have clear expectations from such evaluations and this needs to be explicit to students. If the aim is to make student as the partners in driving forces behind the improvement of higher education practice, the findings from SET needs to be disseminated and responded adequately and in timely manner aiming to address the issues. This will contribute towards the trust building and partnership between the service providers (universities) and the service users (students).

Methodology

This research study used action research to establish students as partners in learning and teaching to measure the effectiveness of student evaluations of teaching (SET). Savin-Baden and Major (2013) describes action research as a method of qualitative research to engage in a problem-solving exercise through a cyclical process of thinking, acting, data collection and reflection. Holloway and Galvin (2017) suggests that action research is a collaborative and participatory approach collecting data and information from a range of sources that is more than a mere production of knowledge about the problem and involves situations where change is necessary or desirable, and researchers employ interventions to improve practice considering power relationships in the setting. This research study adopted the three steps of

Kemmis and McTaggart's (2000: 595) action research spiral, which includes planning for change; acting and observing the process and consequences of the change; and reflecting on the process. Following the completion of the reflection, the spiral continues with the planning process.

The university already uses the SET questionnaire which captures six key areas through fifteen scaled questions. These six areas included achievement of aims, module content, learning and teaching, assessment guidelines, support and supervision, and evaluation. and another six areas through additional comments, which overlaps with each other. Five of these key areas had 2 scaled questions which the learning and teaching encompassed five scaled questions. The other side of the page was used for 'any further comments' which were again divided on the abovementioned six key areas so that students were able to add any free comments on these selected areas. I felt this original SET questionnaire shows limitations in demonstrating engagement and dedication towards students and staff partnerships. The excessive number of items and duplication of information collected within the current questionnaires undermine the achievements of this process and creates confusion among students and makes the process more tedious. I felt there was a need to engage with students, lecturers and other stakeholders to understand their perceptions about the expectations from such evaluations so that the feedback received through this process could become inclusive and contributes towards positive change in teaching and learning. It was necessary to have the SET questionnaires in accordance with the learning and teaching strategy, following a simple model of 'students as partners – conceptual model' (Healey, Flint and Harrington, 2014) that meets the expectations of both students and the faculty. This is where I started my planning stage of the action research spiral process.

In the planning stage of the action research, I engaged with students, lecturers and other stakeholders who were responsible for listening to the student's voices and maintaining the quality of the course. I engaged with first and final year undergraduate students to discuss about their experiences and perceptions of the original SET questionnaire. The selection of first and final year students provided opportunities to place student's understandings and expectations of SET at opposite end of the continuum, where first year students shared their enthusiasm for the change through completing SET questionnaires. Whereas, final year students looked disappointed, as they did not believe SET was used to listen to their voices as per their initial expectations when they joined the higher education. Additionally, the selection of first year students provided an opportunity to collect information from students

who has little experience of completing the student evaluations compared to the third year students who has completed several rounds of these original questionnaires and were in better position to share their experiences from SET. In addition, the initial discussions with lecturers and other stakeholders mostly focussed on the importance and expectations from the SET and how this contributed towards student's experience. The discussions also gathered information around how the original SET questionnaire could be revised to better achieve the outcomes that fits to the learning and teaching strategy of the university. The researcher provided sticky notes to the students, lecturers and other stakeholders to write their perceptions and experiences and also made notes during these discussions. The sticky notes were collected for the analysis purposes.

The information collected from these discussions, together with the reflection from the researcher, who was one of the lecturers teaching those students, formed the basis for designing a new revised SET questionnaire (Appendix 1). The revised SET questionnaire included a total of 15 scaled questions measured on Likert scale [Definitely agree (5), Mostly agree (4), Neither agree nor disagree (3), Mostly disagree (2), Definitely disagree (1)] and three short answer questions that focussed on what they like about the module, any suggestion to improve the module and any other additional comments that was not captured within these questions. Although the total number of scaled questions remained same as the original SET questionnaire, the questions were revised to provide clarity and reflect the expectations from the students and other stakeholders. The duplication of open questions was revised to just three to make the evaluation process engaging and less tedious (Jackson *et al.*, 1999). The addition of questions recording information about students' dedication towards the module and suggestions to improve the module would make them feel as part of the process and equally responsible in enhancing the learning and teaching experience on the module. All the questions were presented on just one side of the A4 page paper, unlike both sides with original SET questionnaire, achieving the psychological advantage for students, as they perceived it as a shorter SET questionnaire. The revised SET questionnaire was developed prioritising the expectations of the students that they seek to evaluate to improve their teaching and learning experiences as well as to meet the expectations from the university to improve the quality of teaching and the course. The aim was to develop a SET questionnaire that is presumably simple, clear, short and overcomes the issue of duplication so that it increases students' engagement by capturing their perceptions and motivations towards the course. This would help students to partner and reflect on their teaching and

learning process and coproduce an opportunity to enhance their overall positive experiences in achieving outstanding education and outcomes.

The second stage of the spiral action research was to act and observe the process to understand the consequences of the change. Acting of the process was achieved through the implementation of the revised questionnaire and then the result of this implementation was observed. I again selected the first and final year undergraduate students, who were involved in the initial discussion that contributed to the development of the revised SET questionnaire, for the purpose of this implementation. I decided to hand in both the original and revised SET questionnaire to these students in the same session, which was last teaching week of the semester. I handed in the original SET questionnaire (unplanned) at the start of the session and asked students to return the completed SET questionnaire before the first break, which was 75-minutes after the session has started. However, for the revised SET questionnaire, I allocated a 15-minute time slot towards the end of the session in the lesson plan. Alongside the revised SET questionnaire, I also distributed some sticky notes so that students could write about the perceptions of the revised SET questionnaire. This 15-minute timeslot was also used by the researcher to discuss and capture students' reflections about the revised SET questionnaire. The researcher made notes during these discussions and collected the sticky notes for the analysis purposes.

The final reflection stage of the spiral action research is used to present the findings of this research. The effectiveness of the new SET questionnaire is compared with the original SET questionnaire and its result is presented in the frequency and percentages. All the discussions with students, lecturers and other stakeholders were categorised under the themes reflecting the key aspects of teaching and learning and some of the key point are highlighted within the finding section.

Ethics

The ethical approval for this study was received in accordance with the Canterbury Christ Church University's guidance for the students on the Postgraduate Certificate for Academic Practice programme. All the participants were informed about the issues of privacy and confidentiality and researcher has ensured to maintain anonymity of the research participants. The time slot for the data collection was embedded in the lesson plan to signify the importance of students as partners in learning. This offered reciprocity in strengthening the

partnership of students in the teaching and learning process. The discussions on learning experiences provided opportunities for students to raise their concerns with autonomy to their expressions in a respectful manner. This also provided an opportunity to treating all students equitably in raising their voice to enhancing their students experience at the university. This research project was built on the existing practice of “end of module questionnaire”, which is an important component of the module and programme to maintain delivering quality education. The project did not seek to do anything different from what is the standard procedure. This minimised any potential disruptions, risk or harm to the participants or their study.

Findings

The findings from this research study is presented in two sections: i) Pre-implementation; and ii) post-implementation.

Pre- implementation

The pre-implementation findings came from the initial discussions with students, lecturers and other stakeholders that led to the development of revised SET questionnaire. Table 1 and 2 shows themes and quotes from the Year 1 and 3 Undergraduate students and the lecturers and other stakeholders respectively.

Table 1: Findings from year 1 and 3 undergraduate students

Themes	<i>Year 1 Student</i>	<i>Year 3 Student</i>
Long, confusing and duplication	<i>This (Original SET) is not very clear and we get confused about what is being asked. It's the same thing on both sides of the paper</i>	<i>This form is too long and the questions are not very clear. I have not submitted my work for this module.. how can I get constructive feedback.. the questions here should be clear and relevant to our experience</i>
	<i>It is too long. There are so many questions and too many answers to write about. We do not feel writing about the same thing what we have already ticked in the boxes</i>	
	<i>This evaluation sheet is very boring and lengthy. It needs to be a little colourful, short with clear questions</i>	

Effectiveness and Expectations from SET	<i>It is necessary to hear our voices, but we wonder if they take this thing seriously. How can we find this?</i>	<i>This is a good process where we can share what we felt about the module but no one pays attention to what we say. We don't know how our feedback will be or has been used.</i>
	<i>It is not straight forward. It does not reflect anything about what we feel. I don't find it useful and it does not change anything.</i>	<i>Completing this form is not going to change anything for us now, we are in final year. We have filled so many of these forms and still we don't know what is being done about it.</i>
		<i>There are different expectations from different lecturers. If we like the lecturer, we may fill it nicely or we will just tick the boxes. Many times, we do not even read the questions we just tick the boxes randomly</i>
Timing	<i>It depends when they give us this form. When they give us towards the end of the class, we are rushing to go home and we don't even read the questions while ticking the boxes. We don't bother to write anything</i>	

Table 2: Findings from lecturers and other stakeholders

Quality assessment	<i>This (SET) is a student led process and the outcomes need to be part of annual programme monitoring</i>
	<i>Module evaluation is important for module report which then forms part of the annual programme monitoring</i>
	<i>Students are more likely to express their concerns through the module evaluation which sometimes help tutors to make informed decision about minor modification for the module</i>
Student's voice	<i>Students should be given maximum opportunity to complete the evaluation questionnaire and the outcomes of this (SET) needs to be shared with the students</i>
Non-completion	<i>Non-completion is the major issue, even the completed questionnaire most often will not have any additional comments</i>
Duplication	<i>I agree there are overlapping areas, but the comment section provide opportunity for students to write about their experiences in details, which they can't do with the tick box</i>

Post- implementation

The post-implementation findings present the effectiveness the revised SET questionnaire and compares this with the effectiveness of the original SET questionnaire. It also presents the perceptions of the students about the revised SET questionnaire. The completion rate for the revised SET questionnaire for year 1 students were 100%, with 66.67% answering the short questions compared to only 80% completion for the original SET questionnaires, with 41.67% of those completing short answered questions. Similarly, the completion rate for the revised SET questionnaire for year 3 students were 94.5%, with 53% of those answering short questions compared to 89% completion for the original SET questionnaire, with only 25% answering the short questions. The combined completion rates for the revised SET questionnaire were 97 % compared to around 85 % for the original questionnaire. If the short answer questions were considered, only 32% of the total students answered the short questions in original SET questionnaire compared to 60% of the students answering short questions in the revised SET questionnaire (See Table 3).

Table 3: Effectiveness of the revised and original SET questionnaire

	Revised questionnaire		Original questionnaire	
	Completed	Short answers	Completed	Short answers
Year 1	15/15 (100%)	10/15 (66.67%)	12/15 (80%)	5/12 (41.67%)
Year 3	17/18 (94.5%)	9/17 (53%)	16/18 (89%)	4/16 (25%)
Year 1 and 3 (Combined)	32/33 (97%)	19/32 (59.37%)	28/33 (84.85%)	9/28 (32.14%)

The students were mostly positive about the revised SET and some of the perceptions and reflections from the students are presented below.

“This is much better and short - just one page, not too much to write. This is really good but still we don't think this will be taken seriously”

“Having the time slot is very good, this means we can complete this but then I would rather prefer the way we are talking about it. Discussing about any issues possibly mid-way through the module would be much better because it will give opportunity to address any issues.”

“This is good but it would be good to have it online and we should get some rewards like print credits for completing this.”

“This is good but we need to know how this is going to benefit us in our learning experiences.”

“This is good but we need to know that our feedback is taken seriously. We should be made aware about how it contributed to any changes”

Discussion

The findings from this action research demonstrated that SET is an important exercise for both the students and the lecturers and has the potential to become a barometer for teaching improvement promoting quality of learning environment and ensuring students as partners in teaching and learning (Surgenor, 2013). The findings suggest that the expectations from SET looked different for both groups with some common interests in terms of student's engagement and measures for teaching and learning experiences. The lecturers and other stakeholders expected students to be partners in teaching and learning and emphasised that student's voice should be heard and they should be made aware about the outcomes of SET as well as any changes that has been done as a result of the SET evaluation process. However, these groups were also focussing more on the quality assessment and the requirements to meet the university process. Students, on the other hand, were cynical about the whole process of evaluation, as the feedback loop was often not clear, and this often affect the reliability and validity of the findings from SET (Burden, 2009). They believed it was just a process to demonstrate students' engagement, but the outcomes do not make any difference in their teaching and learning experiences. Although most of the universities would have a policy that states the feedback from the SET is required to be shared with students via online portal or through student- staff meetings, students are not always aware about this process of dissemination. The differences in expectations and effectiveness of the SET were seen as barriers in motivating students to fully participate in the process of evaluation.

The research highlighted concerns about clarity over the purpose of SET, whether SET was used for measuring the variables of teaching effectiveness or that of the courses to maintain the quality. Moreover, there is a need to consider if SET is measuring only some variables that is easily measurable and leaving out many other variables that is hard to measure. Completing the evaluation questionnaire without having an appropriate knowledge about the process of evaluation and its importance in improving teaching and learning experiences disconnect the students from engaging into the process of SET. It is important to make it

explicit that the system of student evaluations is important at the institutional level, which gives power to the students' voice through addressing the issues from this feedback (Cook-Sather, 2006; Blair and Noel, 2014). The study highlighted the needs for clarity over the process of evaluation, as well as different stakeholders need to understand the expectations from the process. There is also a need to share any achievement from this process with all the stakeholders. This will increase the engagement as well as improve the effectiveness and reliability of the information collected through SET.

Students were also concerned about the excessive number of items on the SET questionnaire (Jackson *et al.*, 1999), which was unclear, repetitive and irrelevant to the personal experiences of their learning. The poorly designed questionnaire, which does not reflect the perceptions and meet the expectations of students, is not useful to fulfil the real purpose of the SET (Leckey and Neill; Penny, 2003). On the contrary, redesigning the questionnaire to make it short and simple increases the response rate of the evaluation questionnaire. Limiting the short answer questions increases the engagement of the students in sharing their short experiences in just two categories "what they liked about the module" and "what are their suggestions for further improvement". In addition, presenting all the questions on just one side of the A4 paper achieved the psychological advantage for students, as they perceived it as a shorter SET questionnaire.

The openness with students and personality of the lecturer were other factors that contributed towards student's engagement with SET (Fah and Osman, 2011; Patrick, 2011). However, this also raised questions about the reliability and validity of the information collected from SET, therefore it should be used as a formative feedback and be combined with other research before making a basis for the overhaul of the module (Zabaleta, 2007; Spooren, Brockx and Mortelmans, 2013).

Additionally, including the evaluation as a part of the lesson plan was seen as an effective way to engage students in the evaluation process. The systematic collection of the feedback through SET and creating an effective action plan to release the response in timely manner by letting students to know what actions has been taken will ensure students at the core of teaching and learning (QAA, 2013), which will further increase the participation of students in the SET. This would possibly make them feel that evaluation is part of the teaching and learning and provides an opportunity to reflect on the experience of the module.

Conclusion

SET is an important instrument through which students can become partners in teaching and learning where students are seen as co-producers of the curriculum rather than the consumers of the curriculum. To achieve this, students need to be part of the development of the SET where they share their perceptions and contribute to the designing of the SET with clear questionnaires that meets the expectations of the students. Students as partners in developing SET will also contribute towards improving the reliability and validity of the information, as this will be a student led process which will make them more engaged in the evaluation process. The systematic collection of the feedback and creating an effective action plan to release the response in timely manner by letting students to know what actions has been taken will ensure students remain at the core of teaching and learning. This will further increase student engagement with SET and will enhance their teaching and learning experiences.

Appendix 1:

[University Logo – Name of the University]

END OF MODULE QUESTIONNAIRE

Module:	Date:
---------	-------

Please complete this questionnaire by ticking the box, which most readily corresponds to your feelings or opinions about this module [**Scale: Definitely agree (5), Mostly agree (4), Neither agree nor disagree (3), Mostly disagree (2), Definitely disagree (1)**]

	Questionnaires	5	4	3	2	1
1	Module was well organised and structured					
2	Learning outcomes were clearly stated, addressed and achieved					
3	Module has provided me with opportunities to explore ideas or concepts in depth					
4	The teaching was clear, informative and effective					
5	Staff used varied teaching activities					
6	I felt fully engaged with this module					
7	The library resources were adequate for the module					
8	The e-learning resources (e.g. Blackboard) were adequate for the module					
9	The assessment guidelines were clear and informative					
10	The criteria used for marking have been made clear in advance					
11	I have received sufficient advice and guidance in relation to this module					
12	Staff has been helpful and approachable					
13	This module has challenged me to develop my thinking					
14	The module enabled me to develop skills that will help my employability and career development					
15	Overall, I am satisfied with the module					
16*	What I liked most about this module and how did it contribute to my development?					
17*	My suggestions for improving this module					
18*	Any additional comments (If you have disagreed to any questions, please explain)					

*Write your experience and use other side of the page to fit in your answers.

References

- Alok, K. (2011). Student Evaluation of Teaching: An Instrument and a Development Process. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23(2), 226-235.
- Blair, E., & Noel, K. V. (2014). Improving higher education practice through student evaluation systems: is the student voice being heard?. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 879-894.
- Boysen, G. A. (2016). Statistical knowledge and the over-interpretation of student evaluations of teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-8.
- Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S. E. (2016). The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1-21.
- Burden, P. (2009). A case study into teacher perceptions of the introduction of student evaluation of teaching surveys (SETs) in Japanese tertiary education. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly March 2009 Volume 11, Issue*, 126.
- Canterbury Christ Church University (CCCU, 2015-22). *Learning and Teaching Strategy 2015-2022*. Available at: <https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/docs/Learning-and-Teaching-Strategy-2015-2020-Web-copy-January-2017.pdf> (Accessed: 01/12/2020)
- Catano, V. M., & Harvey, S. (2011). Student perception of teaching effectiveness: development and validation of the Evaluation of Teaching Competencies Scale (ETCS). *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(6), 701-717.
- Cook-Sather, A. (2006). Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 36(4), 359-390.
- Denson, N., Loveday, T., & Dalton, H. (2010). Student evaluation of courses: what predicts satisfaction?. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(4), 339-356.
- Fah, B. C. Y., & Osman, S. (2011). A case study of student evaluation of teaching in university. *International Education Studies*, 4(1), 44-50.

Fraser, K. & Hack, K. (2015). *Students as partners in learning, teaching and assessment*. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/students_as_partners_in_learning.pdf (Accessed: 01/12/2020)

Gursoy, D., & Umbreit, W. T. (2005). Exploring students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: What factors are important?. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(1), 91-109.

Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York: HEA. Available at: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/engagement_through_partnership.pdf (Accessed: 01/12/2020)

Higher Education Academy (HEA) (2015). *Framework for student engagement through partnership*. Available at: <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/downloads/student-engagement-through-partnership-new.pdf> (Accessed: 01/12/2020)

Holloway, I., & Galvin, K. (2017). *Qualitative research in nursing and healthcare*. John Wiley & Sons.

Huybers, T. (2014). Student evaluation of teaching: the use of best–worst scaling. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), 496-513.

Jackson, D. L., Teal, C. R., Raines, S. J., Nansel, T. R., Force, R. C., & Burdsal, C. A. (1999). The dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(4), 580-596.

Kember, D., Leung, D. Y., & Kwan, K. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching?. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(5), 411-425.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 567-607). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leckey, J., & Neill, N. (2001). Quantifying quality: the importance of student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(1), 19-32.

Malouff, J. M., Reid, J., Wilkes, J., & Emmerton, A. J. (2015). Using the results of teaching evaluations to improve teaching: A case study of a new systematic process. *College Teaching*, 63(1), 3-7.

McCulloch, A. (2009). The student as co-producer: learning from public administration about the student–university relationship. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(2), 171-183.

Patrick, C. L. (2011). Student evaluations of teaching: effects of the Big Five personality traits, grades and the validity hypothesis. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(2), 239-249.

Penny, A. R. (2003). Changing the agenda for research into students' views about university teaching: Four shortcomings of SRT research. *Teaching in higher education*, 8(3), 399-411.

QAA (2013). *Responding to feedback from students Guidance about providing information for students: Guidance about providing information for students*. Available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/responding-to-feedback.pdf?sfvrsn=8d46f981_8 (Accessed: 01/12/2020)

Reisenwitz, T. H. (2016). Student Evaluation of Teaching: An Investigation of Nonresponse Bias in an Online Context. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 38(1), 7-17.

Rowley, J. (2003). Designing student feedback questionnaires. *Quality assurance in education*, 11(3), 142-149.

Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2013). *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice*. Routledge.

Shevlin, M., Banyard, P., Davies, M., & Griffiths, M. (2000). The validity of student evaluation of teaching in higher education: love me, love my lectures?. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 25(4), 397-405.

Spooren, P., Brockx, B., & Mortelmans, D. (2013). On the validity of student evaluation of teaching: The state of the art. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(4), 598-642.

Streeting, W., & Wise, G. (2009). Rethinking the values of higher education-consumption, partnership, community?. Available at: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/434/2/Rethinking.pdf> (Accessed: 01/12/2020)

Surgenor, P. W. G. (2013). Obstacles and opportunities: addressing the growing pains of summative student evaluation of teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(3), 363-376.

Wong, W. Y., & Moni, K. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of and responses to student evaluation of teaching: purposes and uses in clinical education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), 397-411.

Zabaleta, F. (2007). The use and misuse of student evaluations of teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(1), 55-76.