**Student-Staff Partnership Project Grants**

**Example**

**Application Form**

**IMPORTANT**

• Please refer to the accompanying guidance notes when completing this application form.

• Please complete all sections of the form.

• All funds granted must be spent by 31 July 2025.

• The Project should be designed to conclude by 31 August 2025.

|  |
| --- |
| **Applicants**  |
| **Lead applicants** |
| **Staff lead** | Name |  |
|  | Email |  |
| Department |  |
| **Student leads** | Name |  |
| Email |  |
| ID |  |
| Programme |  |
| Year |  |
| Name |  |
| Email |  |
| ID |  |
| Programme |  |
| Year |  |
| **Additional applicants**  |
| Staff For each, list name, Department, email |  |
| StudentsFor each, list name, email, Programme, Year |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project proposal**  |
| **Project title** |
| Developing Learning-centred Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) |
|  **Elevator pitch (max. 150 words)**Why is the proposed project important, what difference will it make, what key steps will it involve, what will its outputs and legacy be?  |
| City St George’s has embedded several Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) tools, including the Student Online Teaching Survey and the Student Experience Survey, to collect, monitor and improve the performance of courses and teachers. The role of in-course formative SET in the enhancement of educational practice is undermined, however, by low response rates and the absence of actionable student feedback received. Staff can also lack knowledge about tools they can use to elicit feedback from students as part of teaching and learning. This student-staff project aims to address this issue, by exploring in-course SET from the student and staff perspective. The project will develop a multimodal toolkit that will enable staff to use SET to develop student metacognition (the awareness and control of how they learn) and evaluative judgement (their ability to assess the quality of their own and others’ performance) as well as develop their own evaluative capabilities as educators. |
| **Inclusive Education (max 100 words)**Please comment on how your project aligns with one or more objectives of the Legacy [St George’s Inclusive Education Framework](https://www.sgul.ac.uk/about/our-education-centres/centre-for-innovation-and-development-in-education/inclusive-education/inclusive-education-framework) |
| The role of students in evaluating teaching is often seen as inherently inclusive but who participates can result in a limited range of student views1. The dominance of questionnaires in Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) makes assumptions about how students can conceptualise and communicate complex, evolving ideas about teaching and learning quality in numeric and text-based modes, taking little account of students with, for example, dyscalculia or dyslexia. Widening the choice of ways students can provide feedback, and drawing on the principles of Universal Design for Learning, will support a more accessible and inclusive approach to collating all student views and developing student feedback capabilities.  |
| **Project description (max. 1000 words)**Please ensure your description includes the following:* What your project is about and what evidence there is that it is needed
* What your intended outputs are and who will benefit from these
* What steps you will take to achieve your outputs (your method) and the proposed timeline for these, including any key milestones
* What each member of team will be responsible for and how you will work together
* Any obstacles you anticipate in carrying out the steps and achieving your outputs
 |
| Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) is embedded into City St George’s quality assurance and enhancement procedures for taught provision at module level via the institutional Student Online Teaching Survey (SOLTS) and at course level via the Student Experience Survey (SES) as well as via the external National Student Survey (NSS) for undergraduate (UG) courses and Postgraduate Taught Survey (PTES) for taught postgraduate (PG) courses. City St George’s PTES response rates are reflective of sector-level poorer engagement with this survey with only 14.9% of students, compared to the sector average of 21.4%, completing the survey in 2023. Although the NSS response rates are comparable to the national average (74.7% in 2023), response rates for SOLTS (24.9% for UG in 2022-23) and SES (31.8% for all years in 2023) show that these surveys also elicit only a small proportion of student views. This is particularly significant because pre-NSS student evaluation provides teachers and the university with an opportunity to address issues raised by students to improve their experience. The alignment of SOLTS and SES to NSS also creates occasions for legitimate feedback coaching and feedback-on-feedback interventions that can help to develop student capacity to understand the principles and practice of giving effective feedback to others.All the student surveys ask questions about how we respond to feedback. Specifically, question 25 of the NSS asks: “It is clear how students’ feedback on the course has been acted on”. While there has been improvement since 2021, when this question received a 37.06% positive rating, the City St George’s NSS positive rating for this question in 2022-23 (50.4%) was still below the sector average (60.9%) and City, University of London (64.3%). While slightly above the NSS rating, SES also received a positive rating of 56% in penultimate year in 2022-23 which, acknowledging the low response rate for final year SES, is still predictive of continuing below sector performance for this question in the NSS 2024.The educator approach to “closing the loop” on student feedback is fundamental, especially given the complexity of drawing meaningful actions from SET and the limited value of simply reporting evaluation outcomes to students. The practice of responding to feedback is not a straightforward administrative task only2. “Closing the loop” provides us with, often unrealised, opportunities to talk with students about the qualities of good feedback and to model good feedback literacy, drawing on the extensive research undertaken in assessment feedback contexts3.SET’s role in improving teaching is still not well-researched in healthcare professions education4. The research available suggests that one barrier to improving teaching as an outcome of SET is that students can be ill-equipped to provide meaningful evaluative feedback and that student satisfaction with, for example, exam difficulty or specific student characteristics are more likely to determine their rating of teaching than the quality of their teachers or teaching for learning5,6. While students are confident they are able to provide good judgements about the quality of teaching and teachers that they experience7, a substantial body of contrary evidence questioning the validity of SET, suggests students may often provide feedback that is difficult to interpret, non-actionable, irrelevant or sometimes prejudicial8.Promoting student metacognition and evaluative judgement is central to ongoing dialogue with students about their learning but it is rarely discussed in relation to SET9. SET, however, can provide an opportunity to develop student evaluative judgement – the capacity to monitor their own and other’s performance for improvement – as an essential graduate outcome for science and healthcare professionals10.This overview of the performance of SET suggests that:1. Low response rates mean pre-NSS evaluation is not inclusive, only offering insights into the student experience from a limited number of perspectives and only using numeric and text dominant modes that may not be inclusive;
2. Student perception of how we “close the loop” and act on feedback is not positively rated;
3. The quality of feedback in SET may not be sufficiently specific or actionable in practice as the basis for improving teaching or learning.

While students are widely acknowledged as having a vested interest in the evaluative outcomes of SET, particularly at national level, it often remains a process engaged in *by* rather than *with* students. This project aims to deliberately disrupt this power dynamic through a student-staff co-design of SET strategies that are learner- and learning-centred. Although the project was instigated by staff, through a distributed leadership approach to the implementation of the project, student leads will have responsibility for delivering key activities and outputs as well as contributing to other activities as outlined in the table below. This is with the aim to develop collective outcomes that reflect the shared perspectives of students and staff in this critical area of academic practice. Through the project, student leads will develop skills and experience in the design and delivery of a pedagogic transformation project inclusive of research and publication skills.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Activity** | **Responsibility** |
| 01.08.24-31.09.24 | Application for ethics approval for workshop data collection and evaluation of piloted resources. | Staff leads with student leads input |
| 01.10.24-13.12.24 | Two student leads, with support from the staff leads, to research and curate a range of possible [classroom assessment techniques](https://cetl.uconn.edu/resources/teaching-and-learning-assessment/teaching-and-learning-assessment-overview/50-assessment-techniques/) and [creative evaluation methods](https://blogs.extension.wisc.edu/yach/files/2020/01/Creative-Eval.pdf) (including visual, audio, object-based, game-based and technology-assisted strategies). Prior to researching the tools, student leads will develop a template, drawing on student-led interviews with the staff leads to capture staff perspectives of SET purpose as well as reflecting on student experiences. Student leads will define criteria for determining a user-friendly and engagement performance rating scale for selecting SET techniques. This template will be used subsequently as the basis for building individual evaluation method sheets as part of the beta version SET toolkit. The toolkit will aim to update the 1998 [Evaluation Cookbook](http://www.icbl.hw.ac.uk/ltdi/cookbook/cookbook.pdf). | Student leads with support from staff leads |
| 01.12.24-13.12.24 | Initial testing of evaluation tools and co-creation of infographic using learner journey mapping to capture student perception of current and ideal experience of the “feedback loop” through a 1.5-hour student-facing world café style workshop. Sampling of student workshop participants will be across courses. Student leads will co-design and facilitate the student-facing workshop as well as lead on the analysis of data and generation of outputs from the workshop. | Student leads to facilitate and generate outcomes with staff support and management of logistics if appropriate  |
| 06.01.25-12.04.25 | Piloting and evaluation of beta version of the toolkit with staff and students in live courses. Participating lecturers/courses will be recruited via Programme Forum, PgCert HBE, monitoring committees as well as Education newsletter and through sharing the toolkit and infographic via the Public Engagement Space. Participating lecturers and their students will be asked to trial and evaluate different methods. Student and staff leads will co-design the mechanisms for evaluating the toolkit and collaborate in the data collection during this stage. | Student and staff leads |
| 01.05.25-30.06.25 | Finalising the selection and refinement of evaluation tools and design of the toolkit and infographic based on evaluation of beta version. Student leads will collaborate with staff leads to determine usability, relevance and improvements to evaluation tools as an outcome of piloting beta version toolkit. | Student leads and staff leads |
| Internal reporting and publication of staff and student-facing resources. Further dissemination through external outputs will likely be completed outside the timeline of the project. Students will co-author, deliver and co-deliver the planned outputs of the project.  | Student leads and staff leads |

The final outputs for the project will be:* A web-based, piloted downloadable evaluation toolkit to support staff in undertaking and responding to formative mid-term evaluation;
* A student-facing SET infographic demonstrating how SET and other feedback mechanisms are used by teachers, courses and the university to enhance the student learning experience (cf. University of Surrey [“How we mark your work](https://surrey-content.surrey.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2021-02/101101%20-%20MySurrey%20Mark%20Journey%20Infographic%20V4%5B2%5D.pdf)” infographic);
* Student-facing resources for staff to use to support in-course student feedback coaching interventions prior to formal SET (e.g. [student-facing guide to giving feedback](https://www.unco.edu/center-enhancement-teaching-learning/pdf/Student-Feedback-Tips.pdf))
 |
| **Legacy and Sustainability of Project (max. 300 words)**Please describe the difference that your project will make and show how you plan for it to be disseminated and embedded across the institution and (if relevant) more widely. Please also consider the sustainability of your project’s outputs. For example, will any additional human and financial resources be needed to ensure that they are kept updated or to adapt them to other settings after the end of your project?  |
| The primary aim of the project is to build a sustainable toolkit of tested SET methods, templates and student-facing guidance that can be used by staff to engage in dialogue with students about their learning experience. The concept of a “toolkit” is intended to essentially create a standardised format and design for presenting each method in individual SET method sheets which explain how and when to use a SET method. These can be augmented over time as additional methods are developed. These methods sheets will be downloadable as part of the CIDE [resources pages](https://www.sgul.ac.uk/about/our-education-centres/centre-for-innovation-and-development-in-education/teaching-and-learning-at-st-georges/resources-and-guidance-for-staff) and under the permanent remit of the staff lead as part of CIDE’s work in relation to developing evaluative capacity in staff.The piloting and evaluation of the beta version of the toolkit and related resources is in itself an important mechanism for building understanding, discussion and embedding of effective dialogic evaluation practices. In addition to the publication and promotion of the planned outputs on a SET sub-page of the CIDE website, the project outcomes will be disseminated internally through:* Student and staff leads Education Ideas Hub/Education Day presentation to share project work and outcomes as required for the SSPG.
* Student and staff leads Edufocus workshop on implementing learner-centred evaluation and creative evaluation practices.

The following planned outputs are likely to be delivered beyond the timeline of the funded period of the project:* Student-staff co-authored *Education Development* article on learning-centred SET for academic developer audience.
* Student-staff co-authored peer-reviewed journal article targeting *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*.
* Depending on student leads' capacity, presentation at student partnership conference or journal, potentially supporting student lead to take lead authorship role and targeting [RAISE Network](https://www.raise-network.com/) Annual Conference and/or a student engagement/partnership journal.
 |
|  **Ethical and data management considerations (max. 500 words)***If the project is awarded, the team will need to consider and address ethical implications and may need to undergo an ethical review process.*  |
| Indicate whether you have read and understood the information about City St George’s Ethical Review Process available here <https://www.sgul.ac.uk/research/research-ethics/ethical-review-process>[x] Yes[ ] No***For any questions about ethical implications or ethical review process, you can contact*** ***sgulREC@sgul.ac.uk*** |
| Please summarise any ethical and data management considerations you anticipate your project will involve. Consider aspects such as potential negative physical or psychological impact on project participants, data collection, management and storage, etc. For questions about potential ethical implications, please contact sgulREC@sgul.ac.uk.  |
| Data collection through the workshop and while piloting and evaluating the toolkit in curricula settings will require informed consent of the purpose of the project including clarification on the use of anonymisation and confidentiality in reporting. Only limited demographic data will be collected as part of the project. Ethics approval is included in the timeline for the project. |
| **Budget** The maximum that can be requested is £1200. All funds must be spent by 31 July 2025. An additional amount of up to £400 can be made available to projects after the end of the 2024-25 academic year for dissemination activities.  |
| Item | Justification | Amount |
| Student leads payment | 2 x 30 hours at rate of £13.92 per hour | £835.20 |
| Voucher | Workshop incentive at 15 x £20.00 voucher to attend 1.5-hour workshop | £300.00 |
| Voucher | Draw for 1 x £25.00 voucher as evaluation incentive to encourage feedback on evaluation toolkit | £25.00 |
| Total amount requested for 2024-25 £1160.20 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Declaration***To be completed by staff and student project leads* |
| Please read through your form and check that it meets the criteria and guidance on the website, then sign and date below.**I have read and understood the *Student Staff Partnership Project Grant* guidance and declare that, to the best of my knowledge, the information I have supplied is correct. If successful, I will honor the stated conditions of the Award.** |
| Student lead name |  | Staff lead name |  |
| Signature |  | Signature |  |
| Date |  | Date |  |
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