

GBS Course Exemplar

1.0 A STUDENT SUMMARY DESIGNED FOR A STUDENT AUDIENCE

1.1 Summary of what students said about the course.

Overall students enjoyed the course - found it informative and interesting. They liked the required readings (although some found the second text too difficult), lectures and assessment items. Some requested better feedback on the reading reports in particular.

1.2 Brief response to what students said about the course

Both required texts should be kept and updated however perhaps we could be more explicit in explaining to student that they are prescribed because they present two different styles of learning. The objective is to improve reading and learning skills as the course progresses.

Lecture slides will be updated.

Assignments will be returned in week 13 in future however the essay due date cannot be set too early for obvious reasons. It is the students' responsibility to use the allocated time in tutorials to ask about assignments and make appointments for consultation if they need help. Staff cannot help if they do not know help is needed. Students are therefore urged to make their assessment concerns known to staff.

There were minimal comments on the reading reports because of time constraints. Tutors are expected to mark the reading reports as part of their work load, but do not have time to write lengthy comments. This issue can be addressed by tutors providing feedback in class when the first report is returned to students. Spending some time on this should allow sufficient explanation of what is required etc. Staff will made aware of this expectation for the next offering of the course.

1.3 How the data was collected.



Student Evaluation of Course (SEC)



Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)



Other (Please describe, eg. Focus groups, 1 minute surveys, custom surveys, peer review, internal communication, self-reflection):

1.4 Indicate where the student summary will be published:

Learning@Griffith

GBS Course Exemplar

1.0 A STUDENT SUMMARY DESIGNED FOR A STUDENT AUDIENCE

1.1 Summary of what students said about the course.

Most students provided positive feedback about this course, with 90 per cent of students regarding it as 'Good', 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' in helping them learn. Specific aspects of the course that attracted positive comments from students involved the high quality of teaching; the relevance and contemporary nature of the course content; the use of current topics and examples, and in particular the use of current media coverage to illustrate themes in the course; and the quality and relevance of the textbook, the course guide and of the lecture notes available on the web. The only major area of student criticism involved the essay topics for the course. Students felt these did not offer them sufficient choice, and that what they were expected to do in order to address the essay topics was not adequately explained to them.

1.2 Brief response to what students said about the course

In response to student feedback on the essay topics, in 2010 students will be given a wider range of topics to choose from. In addition, the Additional Course Information document for the course will include for each essay topic, a short explanation that sets out for students the core issue involved in the topic, and indicates what they need to do in order to adequately address the essay topic. This material will also be utilised by Learning Services staff when they give students a lecture on essay writing in Week 4 of the Course. In addition, tutors will review the essay topics and the material explaining student requirements a number of weeks before students are due to submit their essays.

1.3 How the data was collected.

☒

Student Evaluation of Course (SEC)

☐

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)

☐

Other (Please describe, eg. Focus groups, 1 minute surveys, custom surveys, peer review, internal communication, self-reflection):

1.4 Indicate where the student summary will be published:

Learning@Griffith

Health Group Course Exemplar

1.0 A STUDENT SUMMARY DESIGNED FOR A STUDENT AUDIENCE

1.1 Summary of what students said about the course.

Two positive aspects identified from the feedback:

1. Information was insightful, relevant and clear. Connected theory to practice.
2. Tutorials based on group discussions and exercises were a great way to learn.

Two issues which require attention:

1. Students found the written assessment very challenging. Requests were made to make this a group work assignment.
2. Include a lecture and tutorial on developing a project proposal.

1.2 Brief response to what students said about the course

1. The written assessment is a deliberately challenging one as it is designed to promote students' understanding of core competencies for professional practice. It is important that students gain confidence in this and it will therefore continue as an individual assessment piece. However, more time will be allocated in class to ensure that students understand expectations and process/es.
2. Including a group project proposal is a valuable suggestion and will be trialled for the next offering.

1.3 How the data was collected.

- ☒ Student Evaluation of Course (SEC) ☐ Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
- ☒ Other (Please describe, eg. Focus groups, 1 minute surveys, custom surveys, peer review, internal communication, self-reflection):

Solicited and unsolicited feedback from students throughout the semester and following the final exam. Specifically, students were asked for feedback on the assessment items.

1.4 Indicate where the student summary will be published:

Posted to the Learning@Griffith website in "Course Evaluations" for the following student cohort. The summary will also be emailed to students who just completed the course.

SEET Course Exemplar

1.0 A STUDENT SUMMARY DESIGNED FOR A STUDENT AUDIENCE

1.1 Summary of what students said about the course and brief response to what students said about the course.

From the written responses several aspects of the course received positive evaluation: these were the workshops, the take home assessments and the three module quizzes as well as feedback given in lectures on the keypad questions. For several modules the traditional workshop problems were replaced with enquiry-based exercises in the form of case studies which related the concepts to real life examples. Students appreciated that the take home assessments and workshop really helped with understanding of the course content together with the module quizzes. One student said “the content was continually being learnt, applied and revised – very annoying at the time, but very helpful in the end for learning”. In future, the purpose, learning benefit and importance of the teaching strategy will be more clearly explained. Final marks for the workshop component were significantly higher this year compared to the previous year.

Take home assessments in the form of open book problems to assist with the understanding of course material were introduced in a small way in 2007. Due to positive comments on the course evaluation about how much these helped learning, these were expanded in 2008 to include one problem set per module and were worth 10% of the final grade overall. These assessments provide students with feedback on their progress and understanding and since each in isolation is only worth a few marks they do not penalise students too much for making mistakes. On the course evaluation this year, the most frequent complaint was that the small number of marks attached to these assignments did not warrant the time spent on them. Unfortunately it is most likely that those students who would have benefited the most from these assignments, actually put in the least effort. In fact a major reason for failure of this course was not handing in the take home assignments even though they were compulsory. The time spent on these assignments is valuable learning. These assignments give students an understanding of important concepts and how to apply their knowledge and are very useful in preparation for the short answer section of the exam. In the end 10% can make a big difference to the overall final grade not only because of the marks, but much more because of the learning that occurs while doing the work.

Other concerns that students had, which will need to be addressed, were problems with the timing of the module quizzes at 7pm and the length of the lectures. Some students felt the 2 hour lecture slot is too long although it has always been this way in the past. The course was run as six modules this year with one week for lectures and one for a workshop so that each module was completed before moving on. This structure necessitated merging material from two previous modules into one and eliminating some material that was considered too advanced. In future having lecture slots every week with some sessions run as tutorials will be trialled as a better option.

Students were mindful of time constraints, however felt that the topic dealing with enzymes was too rushed as this was a totally new concept for them. This will be adjusted when timetabling the course next year. Another helpful suggestion in the process of being developed was the inclusion of short answer questions in the module quizzes to give more practice at short answer questions.

1.2 How the data was collected.



Student Evaluation of Course (SEC)



Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)



Other (Please describe, eg. Focus groups, 1 minute surveys, custom surveys, peer review, internal communication, self-reflection):

1.3 Indicate where the student summary will be published:

Learning@Griffith This advice will also be provided to students in the first lecture of the next course offering.

ATS Course Exemplar

1.0 A STUDENT SUMMARY DESIGNED FOR A STUDENT AUDIENCE

1.1 Summary of what students said about the course.

Three aspects of the course that received positive evaluation were the clarity of the course objectives, the management and support of the course and the teaching methods, particularly those related to the enhancement of knowledge and understanding. In both the evaluation of the course and teaching the overall effectiveness of the course registered the highest or among the highest response. The students indicated they were inspired and motivated by the content and delivery, which they evaluated to be either very good or excellent.

1.2 Brief response to what students said about the course

There was one specific issue in both the evaluation of the course and teaching that the students identified as being in need of improvement: the assessment guidelines and the standard expected, which is tied to the criteria of assessment. This issue, I believe is directly related to the fact that very different groups of students take the course from a wide range of majors and therefore methodologies, primary texts, restricted and open projects etc. I have been aware of this issue from the first offering of the course and had attempted to fine tune aspects of sequence and structure this year. In the two times the course has been delivered, students taking the course have self-identified with majors from sociology, education, digital video, theatre, contemporary arts, journalism, cultural theory and music. In addition, the cohort mixture has changed each year resulting in strong responses to different aspects of the course. The final project and the research folio are the assessment items that have produced the student responses. I believe that the best way to address this is to reduce the number of choices for how the final project may be presented. I will also change the briefing session to move more active workshopping of the possibilities which should alleviate some concerns. While I do not believe the criteria for assessment were unclear, the level or standard of third-year independent research projects is in need of clarification, specifically in relation to the thematic approach of the course. My aim of allowing students to follow up on previous research or ongoing interest has been met with students' desire for a more specific task. Therefore, to address this issue, next year I will limit the final project framework and task to give students a more concrete starting point and line of development.

Also as a result of student feedback, changes will be made to the course in the following year affecting two aspects: the proposal and presentation of ideas for the final project will be moved to week 5 and the exam questions will be modified to focus on comprehension and application of concepts from the course reader by supplying quotes, diagrams and examples in the questions and holding a workshop on the example questions at a suitable point in time..

1.3 How the data was collected.

- ☒ Student Evaluation of Course (SEC) ☒ Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
☐ Other (Please describe, eg. Focus groups, 1 minute surveys, custom surveys, peer review, internal communication, self-reflection):
-

1.4 Indicate where the student summary will be published:

Learning@Griffith